

076054

JPRS-TAC-87-002

6 JANUARY 1987

19981209 101

Worldwide Report

ARMS CONTROL

DTIC QUALITY INSPECTED 2

Reproduced From
Best Available Copy

FBIS

FOREIGN BROADCAST INFORMATION SERVICE

REPRODUCED BY
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
NATIONAL TECHNICAL
INFORMATION SERVICE
SPRINGFIELD, VA. 22161

8
127
A07

NOTE

JPRS publications contain information primarily from foreign newspapers, periodicals and books, but also from news agency transmissions and broadcasts. Materials from foreign-language sources are translated; those from English-language sources are transcribed or reprinted, with the original phrasing and other characteristics retained.

Headlines, editorial reports, and material enclosed in brackets [] are supplied by JPRS. Processing indicators such as [Text] or [Excerpt] in the first line of each item, or following the last line of a brief, indicate how the original information was processed. Where no processing indicator is given, the information was summarized or extracted.

Unfamiliar names rendered phonetically or transliterated are enclosed in parentheses. Words or names preceded by a question mark and enclosed in parentheses were not clear in the original but have been supplied as appropriate in context. Other unattributed parenthetical notes within the body of an item originate with the source. Times within items are as given by source.

The contents of this publication in no way represent the policies, views or attitudes of the U.S. Government.

PROCUREMENT OF PUBLICATIONS

JPRS publications may be ordered from the National Technical Information Service, Springfield, Virginia 22161. In ordering, it is recommended that the JPRS number, title, date and author, if applicable, of publication be cited.

Current JPRS publications are announced in Government Reports Announcements issued semi-monthly by the National Technical Information Service, and are listed in the Monthly Catalog of U.S. Government Publications issued by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.

Correspondence pertaining to matters other than procurement may be addressed to Joint Publications Research Service, 1000 North Glebe Road, Arlington, Virginia 22201.

6 JANUARY 1987

WORLDWIDE REPORT

ARMS CONTROL

CONTENTS

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

Soviet Representative Addresses UN on Use of Outer Space (Moscow TASS, 24 Nov 86)	1
Moscow on SDI's Benefits for U.S. Arms Dealers (Ivanov; Moscow Radio Peace and Progress in Mandarin to China, 10 Nov 86)	2
TASS: Karpov Proposed Defining 'Permitted Research' on SDI (Moscow TASS International Service, 26 Nov 86)	4
TASS: Kornilov on U.S. Militarism, SDI, 'Ultraexploitation' (Moscow TASS International Service, 28 Nov 86)	5
Moscow Talk Show View U.S. Democrats' Attitude to SDI (Konstantin Patsyuk, et al.; Moscow Domestic Service, 21 Nov 86)	7
Soviet Academician on Undependability, Danger of SDI (B. Raushenbakh; Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA, 19 Nov 86)	9
PRAVDA's Afanasyev Interviewed on Reykjavik, SDI (Radoslav Radev, Ivan Angelov; Sofia RABOTNICHESKO DELO, 24 Oct 86)	13
PRAVDA Hits SDI Stance of U.S. 'Extreme Right' (Vitaliy Korionov; Moscow PRAVDA, 25 Nov 86)	15
PRAVDA on Velikhov-Sagdeyev-Kokoshin Book on SDI (T. Kolesnichenko; Moscow PRAVDA, 22 Nov 86)	18
PRAVDA Rebuts Japanese Government View of SDI (V. Ovchinnikov; Moscow PRAVDA, 19 Nov 86)	21

U.S.-NUCLEAR AND SPACE ARMS TALKS

USSR: Thatcher-Reagan Talks on Reykjavik, CW, SALT II (Moscow Domestic Service, 16 Nov 86)	23
USSR's Gerasimov: Reagan, Shultz 'Revise' Reykjavik (Moscow TASS, 20 Nov 86; Moscow World Service, 20 Nov 86)	24
Press Conference	24
Further Report	25
Moscow: Adelman Interview, Arbatov Response (Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA, 12 Nov 86)	26
Adelman on SDI, Arms Issues, Kenneth Adelman Interview	26
Arbatov Counters, by Georgiy Arkadyevich Arbatov	28
PRAVDA: Arbatov Rebuttal to 18 Nov Reagan Speech (G. Arbatov; Moscow PRAVDA, 21 Nov 86)	32
USSR: Admiral Sidorov at Vladivostok Parade on Arms Issues (Vladimir Vasilyevich Sidorov; Vladivostok Domestic Service, 7 Nov 86)	36
TASS: UN Representative to Assembly on Reykjavik, Moratorium (Moscow TASS, 11 Oct 86)	38
IZVESTIYA Bessmertnykh-Karpov Briefing on Geneva NST (Moscow IZVESTIYA, 26 Oct 86)	39
USSR Colonel General on Strategic Weapons, INF, ABM Proposals (Georgiy Sedov; Moscow Television Service, 26 Oct 86) ...	41
CPSU's Zaykov to Leningrad Voters on Reykjavik, Testing (Leningrad LENINGRADSKAYA PRAVDA, 30 Oct 86)	43
Moscow: Japan's Words, Acts on Reykjavik Talks Contrasted (Moscow in Japanese to Japan, 11 Oct 86)	46
Indian Journalists Interview Gorbachev: NST, Reykjavik, SDI (Various sources, 23, 24 Nov 86)	47
Delhi TV Version, by Nagvi, et al.	47
Moscow TV Version, by Naqvi, et al.	53
PRAVDA Version	57

SALT/START ISSUES

TASS Issues Warning on Planned Pacific Tests (Moscow TASS International Service, 21 Nov 86)	62
--	----

INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

USSR: Paris Stand on Missiles, Conventional Forces Viewed (Boris Tumanov; Moscow in French to France and Belgium, 15 Nov 86)	63
--	----

CHEMICAL/BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS

Al-Qadhdhafi Said To Be Supplying Chemical Weapons to Syria (Simon O'Dwyer-Russel; London SUNDAY TELEGRAPH, 23 Nov 86)	65
---	----

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

TASS Correspondent Reports on Nevada Nuclear Test (Moscow TASS, 14 Nov 86)	66
---	----

PRAVDA Reiterates Importance of Test Ban (N. Kurdyumov; Moscow PRAVDA, 14 Nov 86)	67
--	----

TASS Urges U.S. To Discuss Test Ban (Moscow TASS, 25 Nov 86)	70
---	----

Moscow: Greenpeace News Conference Praises Moratorium (Moscow Television Service, 3 Dec 86)	72
--	----

Briefs PRAVDA on Mururoa Test	73
--	----

RELATED ISSUES

Gorbachev Trip to India: Statements, Media Coverage on Arms Issues (Various sources, various dates)	74
--	----

Pretrip Press Briefing	74
------------------------------	----

Gorbachev Arrival Statement	75
-----------------------------------	----

Gandhi Welcoming Speech	76
-------------------------------	----

Joint Declaration for Nuclear-Free World	76
--	----

Indian Vice President's Speech, by R. Venkataraman	79
--	----

Gorbachev Dinner Speech	80
-------------------------------	----

Joint Statement of Visit	80
--------------------------------	----

Moscow TV: Gorbachev, Gandhi News Conference	84
--	----

PRAVDA Gorbachev, Gandhi News Conference	86
--	----

Delhi TV Gorbachev, Gandhi, News Conference	89
---	----

Gorbachev Meets President Singh	93
---------------------------------------	----

U.S., PRC Media Cited	94
-----------------------------	----

PRAVDA Editorial on Visit	94
---------------------------------	----

IZVESTIYA Editorial on Gorbachev Trip	95
---	----

'Roundtable' on Gorbachev Visit, by Yevgeniy Maksimovich Primakov, et al.	97
---	----

Moscow 'Panorama' Evaluates Visit, by Gennadiy Gerasimov	101
--	-----

Moscow: 'VREMYA' on Visit, by Vsevolod Ovchinnikov	101
--	-----

Gandhi Statement on Visit	102
Politburo Approves Gorbachev's Visit	103
Moscow Commentary Cites Gen Rogers on Reykjavik, INF, CW (Eduard Mnatsakanov; Moscow Domestic Service, 19 Nov 86)	104
USSR's Petrovskiy to UN on Security Plan, Testing, Space Arms (Moscow TASS, 20 Nov 86; Moscow Television Service, 24 Nov 86)	106
Petrovskiy Speech	106
Comments on Debate, by V. Lobachenko	106
USSR's Chervov Discusses SALT, Antisatellite, Laser Systems (Nikolai F. Chervov Interview; Zagreb DANAS, 7 Oct 86)	108
USSR: German Greens in Moscow Discuss SDI, CW, Test Ban (Various sources, 13, 14 Nov 86)	115
Meeting With Shevardnadze	115
Talks With Gromyko	115
DPA Version of Talks	117
Dobrynin Receives Delegation	117
Greens Hold Press Conference	118
DPA Version of Conference	118
Canada: Poll Shows Nuclear Fear, Cruise Test Opposition (Windsor THE WINDSOR STAR, 7 Nov 86)	120
Canadian Role in Preventing Nuclear War Discussed (Kim Zarzour; Toronto THE SATURDAY STAR, 15 Nov 86)	121

/9987

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

SOVIET REPRESENTATIVE ADDRESSES UN ON USE OF OUTER SPACE

LD250052 Moscow TASS in English 2212 GMT 24 Nov 86

[Text] New York, 24 Nov (TASS)---The Soviet Union offers a real alternative to the space arms race---peaceful exploration of outer space on the basis of cooperation among all nations for common benefit and prosperity, Soviet representative Boris Mayorskiy said at the Special Political Committee of the United Nations General Assembly today.

The Special Committee continued debates on the use of outer space for peaceful purposes.

"Those who prepared to turn outer space into an area of military rivalry and are creating the material base for that in pursuing the ghost of military superiority bear responsibility for all of mankind," Mayorskiy observed.

"The Soviet Union attaches prime importance to the task of keeping outer space peaceful and open for peaceful cooperation. The proposals for preventing the spread of the arms race to outer space, the backbone of the Soviet delegation's stance at the Soviet-American talks in Geneva and the disarmament conference, have evoked a broad response.

"The package of proposals tabled by the Soviet Union at Reykjavik and aimed at finding a radical solution to the problem of nuclear and space arms within the next ten years speaks for itself.

An extended programme of practical actions has been presented at the UN to organize this kind of cooperation. The programme is comprehensive and takes into account the interests of all nations, from leading space powers to countries just embarking on the exploration of outer space," said the Soviet representative.

/9274

CSO: 5200/1131

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

MOSCOW ON SDI'S BENEFITS FOR U.S. ARMS DEALERS

OWI40513 Moscow Radio Peace and Progress in Mandarin to China 0400 GMT 10 Nov 86

[Station observer Ivanov commentary]

[Text] A claim often heard in the United States these days is that the strategic defense initiative [SDI] should be preserved by all possible means because it serves as an insurance policy safeguarding U.S. security.

Dear listeners, the following two statements published in the United States clearly indicate why Washington is so eager to defend this dangerous militarist plan.

The U.S. social organization, the Committee for Economic Priorities, stated that, instead of being a system protecting the United States from nuclear attack, SDI is a policy ensuring a thriving business for arms dealers.

Another statement, made by Adelman, director of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, is both shameless and candid. He said: Giving up SDI is tantamount to killing the goose that lays golden eggs.

Dear listeners: You should understand that those who get the golden eggs are not the American people, but are those arms dealers and bosses of military and industrial conglomerates who determine the U.S. domestic and foreign policies.

We can see from reports carried by U.S. journals that, from 1983 to July 1986, 20 large war-oriented corporations and government research units landed two-thirds of all the SDI contracts. For example, SDI contracts owned by Livermore radioactive laboratory [are] worth nearly \$1 billion. It is very clear that arms dealers will commit any crime for the sake of money.

In socialist countries, nobody makes a windfall from the arms race, nor are there any groups or individuals who want such a race. The nature of socialist countries rules out militarism and intentions of war, and it determines their foreign policies.

Both the Soviet Union and China are firmly opposed to the militarization of space as well as SDI. They understand what sort of serious and irreparable

outcome will result if this plan materializes. Our countries and people are for the establishment of nuclear-free zones and peace zones in various parts of the world. We positively support such zones that have been, or will be, established. Because of all this, people of the world can optimistically believe that world peace can be preserved and consolidated and that the forces of aggression and war can be deterred.

People of the world unanimously agree with what Comrade Gorbachev said on 28 July. He said: History has given the Soviet and Chinese people the most important mission, and many things in international development depend on our two biggest socialist countries.

/9274

CSO: 5200/1131

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

TASS: KARPOV PROPOSED DEFINING 'PERMITTED RESEARCH' ON SDI

LD261045 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0943 GMT 26 Nov 86

[Text] Moscow, 26 Nov (TASS) -- Reykjavik opened up a unique opportunity to enter the 21st century without the strategic offensive weapons possessed by the USSR and the United States and possibly to achieve the total elimination of nuclear weapons on earth by that start of the century. The door that had been pushed open by the efforts of the Soviet Union for a nuclear free world was closed by the efforts of Washington and the main lever by which these efforts were brought to bear was the SDI program. This was stated by Viktor Karpov, chief of the USSR Foreign Ministry Directorate on the Problems of Arms Limitation and Disarmament and head of the Soviet delegation in Geneva at the Soviet-U.S. talks today at a press conference held here.

Right now, said Viktor Karpov, the U.S. Administration is trying to portray the Strategic Defense Initiative as completely compatible with the ABM Treaty. Arguments that SDI is in accordance with the ABM treaty bans the creation [sozdaniye], testing [ispytaniya], and deployment [razvertivaniye] of ABM systems or their space based components regardless of whether these systems or their components are based on those physical principles that existed at the time when the treaty was concluded in 1972 or on new physical principles.

We consistently come out in favor of the ABM Treaty being observed completely and in the form in which it was ratified. We are against the introduction into it of any changes or corrections, the representative of the USSR Foreign Ministry emphasized.

It might be possible to define more precisely the general understanding of the limit of permitted research so that no misunderstanding or possible suspicions may arise concerning the observance of the treaty. There is a precedent here. In the seventies, within the framework of the Political Consultative Commission, a common Soviet-U.S. understanding of the term "tested for ABM purposes," used in the ABM Treaty, was agreed and recorded. This agreement was advanced on the initiative of the United States, and the Soviet Union went along with it. We are now proposing to act similarly with regard to another question -- the understanding of "permitted research" in the field of ABM space systems, which will not require any changes at all in the treaty and can be fully implemented within its framework.

However, the head of the Soviet delegation at the Soviet-U.S. talks said in conclusion, the momentum [inertsia] of the SDI program is obviously so great in the United States that the U.S. side, under various pretexts, avoids this work, which in our opinion, given the businesslike and constructive approach of both sides to the solution of this question, would open the possibility for progress not only on the questions of observation of the ABM Treaty, but also would, on this basis, give a chance to implement the mutual understanding on liquidation of strategic offensive weapons and nuclear disarmament that was achieved at Reykjavik.

/9274

CSO: 5200/1131

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

TASS: KORNILOV ON U.S. MILITARISM, SDI, 'ULTRAEXPLOITATION'

LD281818 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0935 GMT 28 Nov 86

["USA: 'Arms Kings' Avid To Get Their Hands On Other People's Wealth" -- TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow, 28 Nov (TASS): TASS political observer Yuriy Kornilov writes:

"Security is not being strengthened, but dangerously threatened by the creation of yet another lethal and highly complex weapon." This was stated by Indian Prime Minister Rajiv Gandhi in a comment on American plans to militarize space. He was speaking in Delhi on 25 November. The cost of SDI, according to current estimates, could be as high as 2 trillion dollars. The more actively the United States presses on with this project, the more obvious it becomes that this, along with Washington's other military programs, is directly linked with external expansion.

By political maneuvering, bribes and promises, military threats and blackmail, and often by direct interference in the internal affairs of the countries that have achieved freedom, the United States has created a sophisticated system for the neocolonial exploitation and shameless plundering of those countries, and is blocking the progress of their economic decolonization. This is being done in flagrant violation of the UN Charter and the declaration on the granting of independence to the colonial countries and peoples which was adopted by the 25th session of the UN General Assembly in 1960.

The powerful multinational corporations have entrenched themselves in 150 countries. Between them they largely control more than half of the trade of the nonsocialist world. Particularly active are the American military-industrial giants who make up the 'FORTUNE 500' (the term used in the United States for the 500 largest corporations and firm in whose hands almost half of America's industrial potential is concentrated).

According to figures published in the American press, the United States imports about 40 percent of its oil, 100 percent of its titanium and niobium, 98 percent of its manganese, 96 percent of its tantalum and cobalt, 90 percent of its chrome, and so on. And who in the United States is the main consumer of these strategic raw materials? Above all, the military-industrial complex. The "military sector" in the United States utilizes more than 40 percent of the titanium obtained mainly from the developing countries, more than 30 percent of the germanium and thorium, 20 percent of the cobalt and copper, and 74 percent of the oil. Quoting these data, the Indian newspaper PATRIOT comments that "the doctrine of neoglobalism is the brain-child of the military-industrial complex."

The United States is concentrating in its own hands more and more of the bulk of the material resources of the developing countries, and putting it at the service of its

military programs, above all, SDI. It is American militarism that has a direct interest in preserving and intensifying the system of neocolonial ultraexploitation.

The peace-loving states point out that there is direct connection between disarmament and development: and they are actively urging that the militarist principle "armament instead of development" should be replaced by the principle "disarmament for development." That is precisely the purpose of the Soviet proposal to reduce military budgets, in view of the fact that part of the money saved would be spent on helping to eliminate economic backwardness in many of the countries of the world.

/9274

CSO: 5200/1131

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

MOSCOW TALK SHOW VIEW U.S. DEMOCRATS' ATTITUDE TO SDI

LD230016 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1030 GMT 21 Nov 86

["International Situation--Questions and Answers" program, conducted by Konstantin Patsyuk, all-union radio commentator, with Rafail Nadzhipovich Moseyev, international affairs journalist; Professor Radomir Georgiyevich Bogdanovich, Dr of Economics, Deputy Director of the United States and Canada Institute of the USSR Academy of Sciences; Sergey Pravdin (not further identified); and commentator Pavel Kasparov]

[Excerpts] [Patsyuk] Ilya Mikhaylovich Chumakov, of Moscow, asks about the attitude of the U.S. Democratic Party regarding the SDI program. We've asked the deputy director of the United States and Canada Institute of the USSR Academy of Sciences, Prof Radomir Georgiyevich Bogdanov, Dr of Historical Sciences, to tell us about it.

[Bogdnaov] I take it that the question is evidently prompted by the fact that the Democratic Party has once again gained a majority in the Senate. I think it's a natural question to ask, and one that is of some interest. Ever since President Reagan put forward the SDI program in March 1983, most leading members of the Democratic Party has been critical of it in one degree or another. But nowhere in the party's official documents is its generally negative position on SDI actually on record. Nonetheless, not one of the influential Democrats has supported the SDI program unconditionally, and so there is reason to assume that the attitude of the Democrats to this question, which they will have to formulate before the presidential election in 1988, will also reflect to some extent this critical stance in relation to SDI.

There are certain differences in the approaches of the various groupings within the Democratic Party to the SDI program. At least three main tendencies can be distinguished: First, there are the Democrat experts on military policy, Senator Nunn and Congressman Aspin, who supported the limiting of allocations for SDI in the financial year 1987 to less than the administration had asked for. The amount was cut by 34 percent. But, on the whole, their criticism of the program has been muted, being mainly concerned with its technical aspects and the financial expenditure involved. After the meeting in Reykjavik, Aspin expressed his opinion thus: I think a lot of people are going to say that it was a fairly good deal. Nunn warned that after Reykjavik the Congress would watch and criticize Star Wars more than ever before, and that allocations for the program would run into considerable difficulties. Outside Congress, the line taken by Nunn and Aspin has the support of such leading Democrat experts on military policy as Brown, Laird, Schlesinger and Scowcroft, who are in favor of observing SALT II and the ABM Treaty, but also of modernizing strategic arms

systems. There is also a good deal of opposition to the SDI program among Democrat members of the Congress occupying centrist positions. Concern about the vast expenditure that would be needed to implement the SDI program is the dominant motive for such opposition on the part of the centrist Democrats.

And that is the second tendency. In particular, there's the characteristic position of Senator Proxmire, who has been opposing SDI for several years. He considers that the arguments of the program's supporters purporting to show that it is economically attainable and motivated by a desire to plunder the treasury. In May of this year, Proxmire published an article in CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR in which he said that the main defects of SDI were the vulnerability of the space-based systems and the fantastically vast cost of the program. He wrote in conclusion: Even these fantastic expenditures on Star Wars would give us a system that won't protect us from a devastating nuclear strike; meanwhile, SDI will cancel out any substantial progress on arms control.

Johnston and Proxmire were the organizers of a letter that was sent by a large group of senators to the Armed Forces Committee in May of this year, insisting that SDI allocations for the coming financial year should not be increased by more than 3 percent.

The letter was originally signed by 46 senators, and later by 2 more. Among the Democrat Senators who signed it were not only liberals and centrists, but also moderate conservatives like Chiles, Bentsen, Long, Ford, Leahy, Levine, Kennedy, and others. The position of the centrist Democrats in the Congress on SDI is supported by the think tank of the Democrats in the Congress on SDI is supported by the think tank of the Democratic party, the Brookings Institution. The director of this foreign policy research program, Steinbrunner, advocates limiting the SDI program to laboratory research over a 10-year period. Criticism of the feasibility of SDI has been voiced by the well-known scientists Blackman and (Wadgoff). The position of Johnston, Proxmire and the other authors of the senators' letter to the Armed Forces Committee has been supported by the Professionals' Coalition for Nuclear Arms Control, to which the Union of Concerned Scientists, Physicians for Social Responsibility, and a number of other organizations of experts belong.

It is a notable fact that the Democrat Senator Pell, who will soon take up the post of chairman of the Senator Foreign Relations Committee in the new Congress, occupies a position envisaging a certain caution regarding SDI. Commenting on the meeting in Reykjavik, Pell said: This is a sad day for mankind. As I said a year ago, the obvious compromise was, is, and will remain, to achieve a serious reduction in strategic offensive weapons in exchange for an equivalent limitation of the Strategic Defence Initiative. What is amounts to is that we've lost a bird in the hand by chasing two in the bush, in other words, SDI.

The third tendency is represented by the liberal wing of the Democrats in the Congress, led by such figures as Hart and Biden, and in the Senate by Downey, Markey, Dellums, Brown and others. They have opposed the SDI program from the moment Reagan proclaimed it. The members of Congress belonging to this group are against SDI because it has consequences that will destabilize international security, and because of the threat to mankind posed by an arms race in space. The liberal Democrats have actively supported all proposals to cut congressional allocations for the SDI program. Senator Hart's appraisal of that program is of interest, since he is at present seen as a potential Democrat candidate for the presidency in 1988. Hart said after Reykjavik that the President has missed a unique opportunity to conclude a stupendous arms control agreement, and, as a result, he has driven us into a corner for the sake of protecting a highly theoretical and extremely costly program that won't be able to show its viability at least, and at best, until the end of the century.

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

SOVIET ACADEMICIAN ON UNDEPENDABILITY, DANGER OF SDI

PM231440 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 19 Nov 86 First Edition p 3

[Article by Academician B. Raushenbakh, member of the Committee of Soviet Scientists for the Defense of Peace and Against the Nuclear Threat, under the "Scientists on the SDI Program" rubric; "The Illusion of Power"]

[Text] As a result of America's imperial ambitions the accords on the most urgent questions of the day which had been all but achieved in Reykjavik have been left hanging in the air. That fact is indisputable, notwithstanding all the tricks employed by Western propaganda. Today all sensible people in the world realize this with indignation and pain.

The idea of world domination by a single person or power can be observed in human history from Biblical times on, but never before has this ancient idea relied so crucially on scientific and technical achievements of not only the present but the future. And never before have reactionary political concepts been imposed on sovereign countries and peoples by the use of outer space.

The SDI program--which is the president's pet idea--is an attempt to site in outer space the material base for the pursuit of a policy of global blackmail and diktat, for the implementation of America's "neoglobalist" policy in the conditions of our age. And the trillion dollars which make up the first installment in this superambitious project serve as a hyperactive stimulant to the imperialist countries' military-industrial complex, which is fully determined to grab this large sum, whatever the cost to mankind as a whole.

The key link in the "strategic defense initiative" is the desire to possess a "defense shield" from beneath which it can, with impunity, deliver nuclear strikes on an enemy and destroy his ballistic missiles or individual warheads launched as a counterstrike before they are over U.S. territory.

According to the scenario drawn up, the missiles launched will be destroyed during the powered flight phase of their trajectory (up to a height of 500 km) over USSR territory by means of the first echelon of the space-based ABM system. It is planned that this echelon will include space battle stations equipped with laser or beam weapons which are to "burn through" the missiles' fuel-tank casing.

The ABM system's second echelon with space-based elements is designed to destroy missiles during the mid-course [srednii uchastok] flight phase, when the warheads separate. They will be shot down by homing missiles launched by "killer satellites" or electromagnetic cannon capable of firing a small shell at a speed of several tens of kilometers per second. The ABM system's third echelon comprises ground-based antimissile missiles and aircraft capable of carrying ASAT-type missiles.

The main danger of the so-called "strategic defense initiative" is that it undermines the Treaty on the Limitation of ABM Systems and condemns mankind to a feverish arms race. Attempts are being made to convince the broad public with deceptive slogans that the "defense umbrella" will remove all the horrors of nuclear war.

The absurdity and adventurism of the SDI idea lies in the fact that neither three, five, nor any number of echelons is capable of guaranteeing the destruction of all enemy missiles, let alone all warheads. This is very well known to SDI specialists, as is the fact that there are quite a few ways in existence to reduce SDI's already less than absolute effectiveness.

For example, in order for the optical barrels [sterzhni] to be able to transmit beams onto targets when the nuclear-pumped X-ray laser is in operation, the targets must be in the killing zone at the same time. Knowing how this weapon works, there is nothing easier than to stagger the missile launches or ensure warheads separate at different times. It does not involve much work to increase the number of dummy warheads on a missile. It is also possible to carry out dummy launches, launch obstacles (pomekhi) into outer space, and destroy space combat installations by mines, which is considerably easier than hitting a missile, since a space station flies on a known orbit.

The SDI program is [based] on the unfounded assumption that the opposing side will not try to counter in any way the U.S. space strike systems. However, if you take account of natural opposition, the ABM system on offer to the taxpayers for 1 trillion dollars (or more) turns out to be highly vulnerable. Adventurism cannot be hidden by dogmas. This is so apparent that for some time now even the U.S. administration has ceased promising that every American family will be able to sleep soundly under the "space shield" canopy.

Under attack from well-argued criticism, the White House has begun claiming that it [has] not engaged in deploying an ABM system with space-based elements as such but merely carrying out research [issledovaniye]. Research [issledovaniye] for the sake of research [issledovaniye]? In the world of real politics that does not happen. Such work requires vast expenditure and, naturally, it is required to show a return. Despite the clear dangers associated with space ABM systems, the U.S. administration is accelerating scientific research and design development [razrabotka] as part of SDI and is actively involving Japan and West European countries in the race after the space illusion of global power.

Another extremely important factor should also be mentioned. Hitherto the participants in a potential conflict have taken decisions in the light of the

prevailing situation, and these decisions have been taken by people. With the emergence of a space ABM system the situation changes radically: Only 100-300 seconds will elapse from the moment that a target is detected until the moment that a space weapon is used against it. During that time it is impossible to notify either the Pentagon or the president about what is happening. The ABM system will act independently, automatically. It is impossible otherwise: It is necessary not only to detect a missile but also to identify that it is indeed a missile and not a dummy target, to determine whether it is one of one's own or hostile, to begin tracking it, to calculate its flight parameters, and to activate weapons.

That is why the decisions will be taken by automatic devices rather than people. This makes the fate of the world dependent on the soundness of an electronic circuit. These circuits are incredibly complex, they contain an enormous number of elements, each of which can go out of action at any moment. Neither multiple backup nor other means of enhancing equipment reliability can guarantee its 100 percent working order during all its time in operation.

You can imagine the scenario. A large number of stations belonging to opposing sides are in space orbit. All of them are armed, and weapons are stockpiled against each of them. Hundreds of thousands of instruments observe earth and near-earth space. Given such a situation, it is impossible to rule out, for example, that some natural phenomenon, a volcanic eruption, say, will not be taken as the launch of a missile, or that a major fire will not trigger the ABM system into operation.

Satellites used for peaceful purposes only contribute to a small extent to the conversion of outer space into a large system. This term designates the aggregate of various automatic devices which exist in a complex interrelationship with one another, they exchange information, take decisions, and issue and execute commands.

Large modern technological systems work under normal conditions. It does not enter anyone's head to deliberately deceive telephone exchanges about the subscriber being called or to intentionally create interference on a rolling mill's automated control system. The ABM system, however, will operate in conditions of interference and counteraction.

Moreover, from the standpoint of control theory the systems belonging to the opposing sides and trained on each other form a single large system, since they are connected by thousands of links. As soon as a space station receives a signal about the launch of an enemy missile, it will transmit a signal to the devices designed to destroy it--these networks are quite long. Such systems within the equipment carefully regulate, align, and bring their individual elements into line with one another. The testing of a new aircraft, for example, is carried out under realistic conditions. And this reveals a whole mass of very important nuances which it is impossible to foresee at the design stage.

How, then, do you regulate a large system sited in outer space? It is absurd to imagine that one side will make dummy test launches of its missiles so that

one side can align its stations or will demonstrate to a potential enemy the operation of its space battle stations, for enemy mines could then guarantee their destruction.

Thus, an ABM system is being created which must not only work under conditions of interference but is in principle deprived of the possibility of being adjusted, regulated, or fine-tuned under real operating conditions. Therefore, the danger of a nuclear war breaking out as the result of errors by automatic devices sharply increases.

"If the president places his hopes here in SDI, it is in vain. The system will be effective only if all missiles are destroyed. But why then is an antimissile defense necessary at all? What is it being built for? Let alone the resources squandered, which, according to some estimates, will amount to several trillion dollars," M. S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, observed during his Soviet television address.

The mortal danger for the fate of humanity posed by the SDI program and its irrational and absurd basis (in terms of scientific logic) is becoming increasingly clear. The "strategic defense initiative," if implemented, could become a "strategic demise initiative" for the whole of human civilization, since it heightens the danger of nuclear war. It is the duty of all honest people in the world to fight against SDI.

/9274

CSO: 5200/1131

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

PRAVDA'S AFANASYEV INTERVIEWED ON REYKJAVIK, SDI

AU281459 Sofia RABOTNICHESKO DELO in Bulgarian 24 Oct 86 pp 1, 3

[Interview given by Viktor Afanasyev, member of the CPSU Central Committee and PRAVDA chief editor, to Radoslav Radev and Ivan Angelov, RABOTNICHESKO DELO representatives, in Sofia; date not given---first four paragraphs are newspaper's introduction]

[Excerpts] Each of my visits to Bulgaria is a holiday, Viktor Afanasyev says. Your people are not numerous, but the Soviet people accept your achievements as their own, and vice versa.

This time the Chief Editor of PRAVDA, Viktor Grigoriyevich Afanasyev, is visiting Bulgaria in connection with the 10th Congress of the International Organization of Journalists, in whose work he took part as chairman of the leadership of the Union of USSR journalists, leader of the Soviet delegation, and deputy chairman of the International Organization of Journalists.

Viktor Afanasyev is member of the CPSU Central Committee, deputy of the CPSU Supreme Soviet, academician, and author of many books on philosophy, the problems of data processing, and social management.

Radoslav Radev and Ivan Angelov, RABOTNICHESKO DELO representatives, met him and talked with him.

[Radev, Angelov] In this conversation we cannot fail to mention the chief problem of our epoch -- the problem of peace and war -- especially following the Reykjavik meeting. We are acquainted with the evaluation of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and with Mikhail Gorbachev's statements. You are an optimist as an individual, are you also an optimist as regards the global mutual relations between the Soviet Union and the United States, since the world atmosphere and the future of the globe depend upon these relations?

[Afanasyev] I am an optimist as a question of principle. However, as to the great hope regarding the question of whether the problem of "Star Wars" will be resolved in the near future and whether we will agree on this problem, I must admit that I have no hope. Why is this so? Because, first of all, Reagan is not free to adopt a decision, he depends upon the military-industrial complex and the military-industrial complex dictates everything to him. Despite the fact that there is talk about it, I would once more like to stress that the military-industrial complex has tremendous power in the United States.

In the second place, they wish to create great economic difficulties for us, both for the Soviet Union and for our allies, they are trying to force us to get involved in the arms race, to exhaust us, and to prevent us from implementing our domestic program -- the economic, social, and cultural programs of our countries.

This, however, is an illusion.

The third reason "why" is the following: This idea, this mania about achieving military strategic superiority over the Soviet Union and over the Warsaw Pact member-countries has once again taken possession of the Americans. In the past they used to order people about in all things and in all places; later they lost their commanding positions, and were depressed by the so-called "Vietnam syndrome." Now all this is over, and they are again possessed by the idea of neo-globalism, striving to order about everyone and everything. Perhaps they think that we are weak and helpless, incapable of resisting such ideas.

The three factors explain why Reagan has embraced the "Star Wars" system as if it were his favorite child. However, other factors exist -- for example the American people, the peoples struggling for peace; there is public opinion and, last but not least, there is Europe, which is very concerned about the results of Reykjavik.

Reykjavik showed that even the most complicated problems -- the questions of disarmament, of eliminating nuclear weapons -- can be resolved on a political platform. Despite the fact that no concrete agreements were reached in Reykjavik, this was a meeting of great historic importance not only for Soviet-American relations, but for the whole system of international relations. It proved that a way out can be found, that it is possible to reach an agreement. There is a basis for this, there are possibilities.

[Radev, Angelov] When, do you think, can a meeting between Mikhail Gorbachev and Ronald Reagan be held in Washington?

[Afanasyev] I cannot answer this question. Because I really do not know. I think however, that such a meeting is impossible in the near future. What should they talk about? Should Reykjavik be repeated? Therefore it is necessary to create a basis, some sort of progress on the American side is needed.

When will this meeting take place? I do not know, I did not know about Reykjavik, either, although generally speaking I am well informed.

/9274

CSO: 5200/1131

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

PRAVDA HITS SDI STANCE OF U.S. 'EXTREME RIGHT'

PM251414 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 25 Nov 86 First Edition p 4

[PRAVDA political observer Vitaliy Korionov article under the rubric "Echo of Reykjavik": "SDI" A Big Stick Against the World"]

[Text] In the light of Reykjavik, the sinister role of the notorious "Strategic Defense Initiative" became particularly clear. It was SDI which was the means used by the opponents of international cooperation to bar the path to the resolution of questions of vital importance for mankind. Naturally, all over the world the resistance to this White House militarist venture is growing and widening. Hence Washington's subterfuges designed to mask the true nature of the "Star Wars" program.

"Introducing: A Virtuoso in Juggling" -- that was the title of an article by Tom Wicker that appeared in THE NEW YORK TIMES some time ago. First the American observer cited such instances of the fraudulent "juggling" of facts Washington-style as, for instance, the assertions that "taxes can be cut, military spending increased, and the budget can still be balanced," or: "If unemployment this month is 7.15 percent as against 7.25 percent last month, the juggling virtuosos will declare that the economy is on the upswing." But everything, Wicker notes, "was eclipsed by the circus put on by the juggling virtuoso and his assistants after the Iceland summit." The journalist explains: "We have now been lucky enough to make the acquaintance of the one and only juggling virtuoso who can send a ball on the most intricate trajectory, presents conjuring tricks better than anyone, and has probably broken all records in the art of presentation. It turns out that this is not a magician from the emerald city, but President Ronald Reagan," Wicker states. These "conjuring tricks" include the White House's attempts at all costs to disguise the militarist nature of SDI and present it as practically an "olive branch" being sent into the depths of space.

But truth is stronger than "juggling." On the eve of the present "team's" installation in the White House, an article was published in the United States by one of the ideologists of the extreme right -- R. Tucker, in which he put forward the slogan: "The clock must be put back at least 15 years." This means approximately to the beginning of the seventies, when the U.S. ruling class had the hope of holding in its hands military superiority over the Soviet Union. But the more apparent it became that this superiority cannot be retained on earth, the more persistently the hegemonists turned their gaze to the skies. Perhaps it is from there that the "divine mission" will descend on America, perhaps from space it will be possible to "control the whole world." It was no accident that the President's 23 March 1983 speech, which set forth the "Star Wars" program, declared: "We are beginning efforts which promise to change the course of human history."

But how can you change the course of history when billions of people have already made their choice, once and for all, in favor of peace, freedom, and socialism? Imperialism sees the militaist nuclear stick as the main instrument here. By brandishing this stick, the politicians, obediently following the orders of the military-industrial complex, would like to acquire the opportunity to impose their own will on all peoples and countries.

The journal POLICY REVIEW recently printed an article by Robert Dole. Dole is still the leader of the Republicans in the Senate, but the article is presented in the journal which is the organ of the Heritage Foundation -- the nerve center of the most diehard reaction. Dole does not disguise his attitude to us. The USSR, he declares, is the "sworn enemy." It is from this standpoint that the Republican boss strives to proclaim "common principles for an approach to the Russians." What principles? The "big stick" -- that is the title of the third section of the article, and answers that question.

Dole sees Soviet-American relations only through gun sights. And he assigns to SDI the main role of "stick." "We must possess significant technical superiority over the Russians in both nuclear and conventional arms," he cries. And he specifies: "The main means for this could be SDI."

It is superfluous to say that the pugnacious senator is infuriated by the very idea of the possibility of detente in Soviet-American relations, or international relations in general. "The imaginary god of detente," "detente is a dangerous myth" -- such utterances are scattered through the article. "Only if we can get rid of the idea of detente once and for all will we have a real chance of achieving what we want in relations with the Russians" -- that is R. Dole's creed.

The Doles are evidently not capable of the new way of thinking. They have learned no lessons from the history of Soviet-American relations, even in recent decades. Let us recall: In the seventies, when military-strategic equality was established between the USSR and the United States, a series of large-scale agreements were concluded between our countries, and that was of inestimable benefit to the cause of universal peace. But the present U.S. Administration not only has not concluded a single agreement with the USSR, but even seeks to destroy everything that was concluded formerly. The harm this does to the cause of universal peace, including the security of the United States itself, is obvious to every sensible person.

But the whole point is that there is a clear shortage of sensible people in Washington's offices. Those who are "crazy" speak most forcefully there. The notorious Richard Perle, for instance, assures people that SDI is like a locomotive "pulling the arms control train." [paragraph continues]

But Reykjavik clearly showed that SDI is drawing this train in precisely the wrong direction. As for verification, the Soviet Union only had to declare that it consents to any forms of verification of the disarmament process, whereupon the "lovers of verification" across the ocean, who had shouted until they were hoarse that the whole question of ending the arms race rested on verification, suddenly lost interest in the subject.

Now let us try to look at things from another angle. Washington claims: The United States only had to step up the implementation of the SDI program for the USSR to "appear" at the table in Geneva for talks on nuclear and space arms. Hence the assertion: SDI is Washington's trump card at the talks. But what if the Soviet Union resorts to the same tactics and declares that in no event will it agree to a reduction

of ground-based ballistic missiles, since this is the threat which is supposed to keep the Americans at the conference table? What would the future of the talks then be?

In putting forward its far-reaching proposals in Reykjavik, the Soviet Union made considerable concessions to the American side. This was done in the name of peace. But let Washington not forget V.I. Lenin's words: "We have repeatedly declared our desire for peace, stated that we need peace... But we do not intend to allow ourselves to be stifled to death for the sake of peace." We do not intend to, and will not!

/9274

CSO: 5200/1131

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

PRAVDA ON VELIKHOV-SAGDEYEV-KOKOSHIN BOOK ON SDI

PM030937 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 22 Nov 86 Second Edition p 4

[Article by T. Kolesnichenko: "Anatomy of SDI"]

[Text] So much has been said and written about the U.S. "Star Wars" program, packaged as the "Strategic Defense Initiative" (SDI), that you might think it would be difficult to add anything more. But I have in front of me a new book -- "Space Weapons: A Security Dilemma" [Kosmicheskoye oruzhiye: dilemma bezopasnosti] -- just published by the "Mir" publishing house. It was compiled by the Committee of Soviet Scientists in Defense of Peace and Against the Nuclear Threat (editors Academician Ye.P. Velikhov, vice-president of the USSR Academy of Sciences; Academician R.Z. Sagdeyev; and Doctor of Historical Sciences A.A. Kokoshin). It is immediately apparent that neither we nor English-speaking readers (the book is published simultaneously in Russian and English) have previously had such coherent information on the SDI program and the space weapons being created in the United States, their potential, and various possible components.

The book's authors have analyzed for the first time on the basis of extensive factual material and have comprehensively examined the scientific, technical, and international political consequences associated with the prospect of the creation of an extensive antimissile system with space-based elements. The serious and multifaceted analysis leads the authors to a profound scientific conclusion: Such a system cannot be seen as purely defensive, but represents a new, comprehensive type of weapon whose emergence gives a powerful boost to the arms race and increases the risk of a nuclear war.

The first five chapters are a meticulous analysis of the space echelon of the extensive ABM system and the individual types of new weapons: Laser, beam, kinetic energy, and electromagnetic impulse weapons and ABM space combat stations. The authors demonstrate irrefutably that none of these weapons is by any means "purely defensive." The possible deployment of weapons involved in the ABM system directly above enemy territory, the use of powerful sources of energy, which can be transmitted in virtually an instant over an infinite distance, and so forth will create extensive opportunities for attacking various air and ground targets. In short, in accordance with SDI, a weapon is being created which it will be possible to use for a first strike against ground targets. It is characteristic that this aspect of the problem is virtually ignored by all official U.S. documents on SDI, since it totally refutes the "defensive logic" of the program's authors.

The sixth chapter examines measures and means of countering space strike weapons. This is a very important question. In fact, in its SDI propaganda Washington officials do emphasize the "invulnerability" of the system, which, apparently, will be a reliable

"shield" protecting the United States against ballistic missiles. U.S. television keeps on showing publicity cartoons: A happy American family is sitting beneath a dome with "enemy" missiles smashing to pieces as they hit it.

But the scientists cite irrefutable data demonstrating that it is easy now to find active means of neutralizing and destroying the extensive ABM systems. The most vulnerable elements are space communications, which can be disrupted, blocked or even put out of action completely, the combat control subsystem, and, above all, the central computer, various power sources (nuclear installations, fuel), and so forth. So we are not concerned with the reply. It will be found. What we are concerned with, and this is well demonstrated in the book, is the fact that SDI entails a quantitative and qualitative leap forward in the buildup of strategic nuclear armaments -- above all ICBM's and so-called "dummy missiles" [lozhnyye rakety].

U.S. deployment of an extensive ABM system with space-based elements or individual combat subsystems would be a direct violation of the 1972 ABM Treaty. In such a situation the Soviet Union, quite naturally, could be faced with the necessity, in the interests of its own security, of considering itself released from the obligation to observe both Article XII of the treaty, which prohibits deliberate concealment measures which prevent verification from being carried out, and the SALT II Treaty which limits the number of ICBM's and the construction of additional launch installations for them. As a result of these and other measures (an increase in the number of warheads on ICBM's, a shorter flight time in the powered-flight part of the trajectory, and so on) the reliability of the "space shield" would be sharply reduced. The scientists reach the overall conclusion that one of the dangers of the extensive ABM system (SDI, in other words) is that it leads to a new arms race spiral--it causes the other side to build up strategic forces and countermeasures with all the adverse consequences that this entails for international security.

It should be noted that many U.S. scientists are reaching the same conclusions. In the United States, THE WASHINGTON POST writes, nearly 7,000 scientists, including 57 percent of physics teachers at 20 major universities, have declared their resolute opposition to the "Star Wars" program and have refused to accept money for SDI research. This wave of protest is rising all over America. An appeal to scientists not to participate in studies associated with "Star Wars" has been circulated in 110 universities.

As the well-known physicist David Roper, professor at the Virginia Polytechnic Institute, said, "We do not need a colossal arms system costing many millions of dollars, we need a continuation of what they are trying to achieve in Reykjavik." He is echoed by Professor John (Kogut) of the University of Illinois: "The protest is spreading, and I believe it will grow ever more quickly since Reykjavik, which convinced everyone that SDI is the obstacle in the way of genuine arms control."

The concluding chapters of the book are devoted to the international political and legal aspects of SDI. The authors as it were sum up all the details of research on the anatomy of SDI and arrive at important political generalizations. The chief one is that the task of preventing the nuclear missile

catastrophe that threatens mankind are incompatible with the development [razrabotka], testing, and deployment of space strike weapons, with the implementation of the SDI program, and with violation of the ABM Treaty. On the contrary, in conditions of a real reduction of nuclear armaments, and even more so their elimination, it is necessary to strengthen this treaty. It is obvious of it that is the real guarantee against all manner of "surprises," subterfuge, deviations, and other disruptions of the mutual process of disarmament. In these conditions the SDI program is a massive attempt to secure strategic military superiority for the United States, it is an extension of the international position of strength policy, and finally, it totally disregards U.S. international law commitments and the interests of international security.

The prevention of a nuclear catastrophe urgently demands a ban for all time on the use of force in space and the prevention of the [word indistinct] of space. "Star Peace," not "Star Wars"--that is the principle with which we **counter the authors** of SDI. It enshrines a peaceful future for our planet and the continuing existence of terrestrial civilization.

/9274

CSO: 5200/1131

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

PRAVDA REBUTS JAPANESE GOVERNMENT VIEW OF SDI

PM211459 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 19 Nov 86 First Edition p 5

[V. Ovchinnikov "Rejoinder": "The Laser and the Bullet"]

[Text] The Japanese prime minister and foreign minister, who recently had to answer questions in parliament about the government's consent to join in the U.S. "Star Wars" program, were not to be envied. The framework of the debate was as follows: The opposition took the line that Japan's participation in SDI is at variance with the "three non-nuclear principles" and the parliamentary resolution on space research and development for exclusively peaceful purposes. And the government's line was that SDI is a nonnuclear program leading to the elimination of nuclear weapons. Defending such a position after Reykjavik, when it became abundantly clear that the way to a nonnuclear world is barred precisely by the U.S. plans for the militarization of space, was an unenviable task. They had to twist and turn, do violence to logic, and juggle with facts. Here are some examples:

Deputy: Is it possible to describe a nuclear-pumped x-ray laser as a "nonnuclear weapon"?

Prime minister: A nuclear weapon is a weapon in which a nuclear explosion is used directly to kill people or destroy material assets. A weapon involving indirect use of a nuclear explosion cannot be described as a nuclear weapon.

Deputy: Will Japan refrain from participating in SDI if it is proved that nuclear weapons are nonetheless used as part of the program?

Prime minister: SDI as a whole is a nonnuclear weapon. It serves as a means of destroying ICBM's. The x-ray laser is only one component of the system. Furthermore, it still is not completely clear what it represents.

Question: Does not joining SDI constitute an act of collective defense which is banned under the Japanese Constitution?

Foreign minister: Participation in SDI does not entail actual use of force, and therefore it does not signify the exercise of the right to collective defense...

And what about the "three non-nuclear principles"? The Japanese Foreign Ministry takes the view that they apply only to Japan. And it claims that the restrictions imposed by those principles do not apply to furnishing the United States with technology which can be used in the creation of nuclear arms.

Strange logic indeed! It appears that production is banned, but participation in production is allowed. It appears that a nuclear explosion is one thing, yet its energy transformed into lethal rays intended to destroy targets in space and on earth in something entirely different. It appears that there is no connection between a rifle and the bullet it fires. And what does the "indirect" impact of a nuclear explosion mean? After all, U.S. atom bombs were exploded over Hiroshima and Nagasaki rather than over Japan. But that made no difference to the fate of those who were killed or maimed.

/9274

CSO: 5200/1131

U.S.-USSR NUCLEAR AND SPACE ARMS TALKS

USSR: THATCHER-REAGAN TALKS ON REYKJAVIK, CW, SALT II

LD161755 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1600 GMT 16 Nov 86

[Text] At his country residence at Camp David, President Reagan has had talks with Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher of Great Britain. At a press conference after the talks the head of the British Government stated that, in the view of Washington and London, in the situation that has taken shape after the Soviet-U.S. summit in Reykjavik, the priority tasks are to reach agreement on medium-range missiles, to reduce U.S. and Soviet strategic weapons by 50 percent in the next 5 years, and to ban chemical weapons.

At the same time, the same statement was read out to journalists in the White House by a high-ranking representative of the administration. While backing up in words the aim of reaching agreement on arms control, the Republican administration and the Tory Government are in fact seeking to depart from the positions agreed in Iceland. During the press conference Thatcher once again affirmed her government's support for the U.S. Star Wars program. At the same time, as the Washington correspondent of the British SUNDAY TIMES points out, during the talks Thatcher insistently called upon the United States to adhere to the provisions of the SALT II treaty.

/9604

CSO: 5200/1101

U.S.-USSR NUCLEAR AND SPACE ARMS TALKS

USSR'S GERASIMOV: REAGAN, SHULTZ 'REVISE' REYKJAVIK

Press Conference

LD201548 Moscow TASS in English 1525 GMT 20 Nov 86

[Text] Moscow November 20 TASS -- Gennadiy Gerasimov, head of the Information Department of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs, has described the recent speech of the U.S. secretary of State George Shultz as a "complete revision" of the Reykjavik and Geneva ideas.

"Mr. Shultz offered his own version of what had taken place in Reykjavik. He made no mention of the fact that the U.S. President had agreed with the proposal of Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, to scrap all the strategic offensive forces. This agreement was actually taken back after the Reykjavik meeting", the spokesman of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs pointed out at a press conference here today.

Touching upon the recent speech of U.S. President Ronald Reagan in Washington, Gennadiy Gerasimov pointed out that the President's reasoning about human values and freedoms was full of distortions and tendentiousness, because it was outside basic ethics. One can only regret that the leader of the great power resorts to vulgar rhetoric and nasty words.

He said that the President had come up with this emphatically anti-Soviet speech precisely at this time because he had intended to distract the attention of the public from the failure at the elections and the scandal over U.S. arms deliveries to Iran, as well as to play up to the ultra-right-wing forces in the country. The President's statements on the striving for nuclear disarmament and his allegiance to Reykjavik remain nothing but words. In this connection the spokesman of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs recalled that in the first committee of the U.N. General Assembly the U.S. delegation had supported less than half of the resolutions adopted by it.

Gennadiy Gerasimov called the attention of journalists to the address to parliaments and peoples of the world adopted Wednesday by the session of the USSR Supreme Soviet. He said: "The awareness of the community of historic destinies of all the countries and nations brings about the need for joint actions for the sake of warding off the menace of a nuclear war. Soviet proposals on nuclear disarmament set forth in the appeal are based on what was achieved in Reykjavik."

Further Report

LD201926 Moscow World Service in English 1810 GMT 20 Nov 86

[Text] The head of the Information Department of the Soviet Foreign Ministry, Gennadiy Gerasimov, has given a briefing for members of the press here in Moscow. He drew attention to the importance of the appeal adopted by the USSR Supreme Soviet in which it called on parliaments and nations of the world to act resolutely in favor of a transition in practical terms to building a nuclear-free world and creating reliable security in equal measures for all nations.

Gennadiy Gerasimov said that the Soviet Union is aware of the community of the historic destinies of all countries and peoples in the face of the nuclear threat. The awareness of the fact that we all are in nuclear jeopardy dictates the need for joint action to remove the nuclear threat. Our parliament believes, Gennadiy Gerasimov said, that no government or parliament can evade the responsibility. The spokesman for the Soviet Foreign Ministry noted the special danger posed by the American SDI program to take the arms race to outer space. The arrival of space weapons, he said, would dash every political chance to control the course of events. A technical malfunction or error in a computer may cause terrible calamity. As Gennadiy Gerasimov put it, when politicians meet each other in heaven after a nuclear catastrophe, any dispute between them as to whose computer was faulty will be beside the point.

Gennadiy Gerasimov said that the Soviet Union believes that in this nuclear and space day and age national security cannot be ensured by means of any military technology. It can be ensured by political methods and negotiations only. The United States and the West are committed to a different philosophy, according to which if one wants peace one must prepare for war.

The Soviet Union intends to proceed in future from the agreements reached at Reykjavik. The United States rejects these agreements.

The U.S. secretary of state, George Shultz, has declared that peace can only be maintained through force and that the nuclear deterrent must remain there for an indefinite period. He also proposed, contrary to the agreements reached at Reykjavik, that a certain number of ballistic missiles should remain there as a sort of insurance. The question is, Gennadiy Gerasimov went on to say, why the United States is saying now that it is committed to what was achieved at Reykjavik. What is that deception for? Why can't the United States make a clean breast of it? Why can't it acknowledge that Reykjavik has been forgotten and that it was no more than America's deviation towards common sense and that now everything is back to square one in the United States, rolling as it did before along the track of the arms race and anti-Sovietism?

Gennadiy Gerasimov gave the following example: At the current session of the United Nations General Assembly the First Committee adopted 67 draft resolutions on disarmament. More than half of those were not backed by the United States. Washington voted against the resolution on preventing a nuclear war, halting nuclear tests and preventing the militarization of outer space.

Answering a question about the forthcoming visit to India by the Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev, the spokesman for the Soviet Foreign Ministry has this to say: We attach great importance to Mikhail Gorbachev's visit to India. There can be no doubt at all that the visit will go ahead in a spirit of the idea to strengthen security in Asia and the Pacific. My opinion is, Gennadiy Gerasimov said, that it will be of great interest from the point of view of political news.

U.S.-USSR NUCLEAR AND SPACE ARMS TALKS

MOSCOW: ADELMAN INTERVIEW, ARBATOV RESPONSE

Adelman on SDI, Arms Issues

PM131618 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 12 Nov 86 First Edition p 5

[Interview with Kenneth Adelman, director of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, under the general heading "Reykjavik: 1 Month On": "Kenneth Adelman: 'SDI Will Be an Insurance'"; date of interview, identity of interviewer not stated]

[Text] [Interviewer] At the Soviet-American meeting in Reykjavik, a rapprochement in the position of the United States and the USSR was noted. In what direction, in your opinion, should we now proceed?

[Adelman] In Reykjavik the President discussed with General Secretary Gorbachev the main elements of American-Soviet relations. Specifically: arms control, human rights, the resolution of regional conflicts, and the improvement of bilateral relations. The President made it clear that in order to improve relations greater respect for human rights is needed on the part of the Soviet Union; that the Soviet occupation of Afghanistan and the continuing military support for the regimes in Angola, Nicaragua, and Cambodia may be detrimental to American-Soviet relations; and that the United States seeks to expand contacts between people, so that American and Soviet citizens can learn at first hand about each other's country and culture.

As far as arms control is concerned, your assessment of the progress achieved in Reykjavik is correct. The United States and the USSR agreed on deep cuts in strategic nuclear arms and medium-range nuclear arms over the next 10 years, including a commitment by the Soviet Union significantly to reduce its forces consisting of ground-based ballistic missiles. We reached an agreement that a global ceiling should be established of 100 warheads for increased-range medium-range missiles [rakety sredney dalnosti s povyshennym radiusom deystviya], whereby there will be no such missiles in Europe, while elsewhere each side will be able to have no more than 100 warheads on such missiles. We also made progress as regards achieving an accord on how to ensure in practice limits on nuclear tests.

We should now seek to achieve agreements of principle in Geneva and to incorporate them in concrete treaties in the arms control sphere. The President adheres firmly to the cause of consolidating the progress achieved in these spheres; thus laying the foundations for more productive talks, the President believes that additional meetings between the two leaders will help to develop the progress achieved in Reykjavik both in the arms control sphere and in other spheres of American-Soviet relations. His invitation to Mr Gorbachev to hold a summit meeting in the United States remains in force.

[Interviewer] It has now become clear that the "Star Wars" program is the main obstacle to achieving important agreements in the arms control sphere. What is the administration prepared to do to solve this problem?

[Adelman] We cannot accept this interpretation, which is convenient to you. The American "Strategic Defense Initiative" was not the main obstacle to the attainment of agreements in the arms control sphere in Reykjavik. The Soviet Union's assertion that SDI is an offensive program which was the reason why agreements were not achieved is erroneous. The Soviet Union, like the United States, is creating [sozdayet] a defense designed to rebuff a ballistic missile attack. For instance, the Soviet laser program is on a significantly wider scale than the American program. [paragraph continues]

More than 10,000 scientists and engineers and more than half a dozen research and design institutions and testing ranges are taking part in its implementation, including the range at Sari-Shagan.

The research we have carried out thus far in the sphere of SDI shows clearly that the technology we are studying is not suitable for use for offensive purposes. As soon as the Soviet Union acknowledges this fact and agrees to hold serious talks with a view to concluding agreements in the arms control sphere which would significantly reduce arsenals of offensive nuclear arms, progress could be achieved. I call on the Soviet Union to accept the U.S. proposal and go along with us in opening research institutions for mutual inspection. This confidence-building measure should provide the answer to any questions concerning the two sides' efforts in the strategic defense sphere.

[Interviewer] Various representatives of the administration have recently made contradictory statements as to whether the administration is ready to seek the elimination of all nuclear arms. So is it, or is it not, ready to seek the elimination of all nuclear arms?

[Adelman] As the President has stated repeatedly, the United States adheres firmly to the ultimate objective of removing all nuclear arms from the face of the earth. That is the objective which has been publicly stated by both the United States and the USSR. The United States has proposed -- both at the Geneva talks and in Reykjavik -- to take practical steps which would bring us closer to that ultimate objective. The President proposed that in the next 5 years both sides reduce their strategic offensive arms by 50 percent, and he also proposed that in conjunction with the 10-year agreement not to deploy [razvertivat] advanced strategic defense systems, but to continue the research, development [razrabotka], and testing of strategic defense, as is permitted by the Treaty on the Limitation of ABM Systems, both sides should eliminate all their remaining ballistic missiles by 1996. These proposals are concrete, significant steps along the path to the elimination of all nuclear arms -- an objective which must be seen in the context of a time when we will have a better balance in the sphere of conventional armed forces, when an effective global ban on chemical and biological arms will be in force, and when we will have effective strategic defensive systems at our disposal.

[Interviewer] The objectives of ridding the world of missiles and creating [sozdaniye] a strategic defense against those same missiles appear contradictory. How can you explain that?

[Adelman] The United States believes that ridding the world of ballistic missiles and creating a strategic defense against such missiles are complementary objectives. The development [razrabotka] of a strategic defense by both sides while offensive missiles are reduced would facilitate the rapid reduction of ballistic missiles. As soon as the world is free from ballistic missiles, the existence of strategic defense systems will serve as an insurance, so that no country and no madman can ever again threaten the world with ballistic missiles. Referring to an analogous situation, President Reagan has repeatedly observed that the world has banned the use of toxic gases. But we have not thrown away our gas masks.

Arbatov Counters

PM121250 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 12 Nov 86 First Edition p 5

[Commentary by Academician Georgiy Arkadyevich Arbatov, director of the USSR Academy of Sciences United States of America and Canada Institute, on interview given by Kenneth Adelman, director of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, to SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA, published as part of the "Reykjavik: 1 Month On" feature compiled by A. Borovik, M. Knyazkov, and V. Khilchevskaya: "Georgiy Arbatov: 'Another Round of the Arms Race'"]

[Text] In his answers to SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA's questions Mr Adelman did not manage to do without propagandist flourishes and distortions of the facts. These are, in general, the tactics of the present Washington administration. If you read his interview, you form a totally distorted impression of Reykjavik. First, it appears that Comrade Gorbachev and President Reagan took with them proposals of at least equal value, which were then discussed on equal terms. Second, it appears that attention was devoted to Afghanistan, Angola, Central America, human rights, and so forth, as well as to the problem of disarmament, in equal measure. This was not at all what happened. There were no proposals at all from the American side. The Soviet delegation brought concrete proposals, expounded on three pages, which were handed to the American President at the first session, then discussed by him with Comrade Gorbachev, and subsequently debated during talks lasting the entire night between Soviet and American experts. Among the latter, incidentally, was Mr Adelman, who could not fail to know that it was the American, not the Soviet, delegation which went to Reykjavik empty-handed. The U.S. delegation, I repeat, submitted no proposals at all. When we pressed them: Well, what do you propose? -- I remember that Adelman, like the others, maintained a painful silence and showed a lack of willingness even to discuss anything concrete. Instead, the American took a break -- first for 40 minutes, and later for 1 hour 40 minutes. In the end they brought us a very peculiar text by way of "answer." This contained only their past proposals which they had already submitted, proposals to which we had already given our response.

Adelman agrees that a rapprochement between the positions of the United States and the USSR was noted in Reykjavik. But it is more correct to speak not of a rapprochement, but of the Americans' agreement with some of our proposals, which we had prepared honestly, seeking wherever possible to take the U.S. position into account.

Of course, in the course of the Reykjavik talks questions unconnected with the disarmament problem were also discussed. But their place was insignificant, because of the particular importance of questions of military detente, and not because we were afraid to discuss human rights or, for instance, regional conflicts in Central America and the Middle East or because we underestimate the importance of those problems. Mr Adelman is apparently still trying to represent Afghanistan as a trump card in the Americans' hands. What kind of trump card?! The United States is a participating side in the conflict: Let it not assume the pose of arbiter or moralist. Washington equips the dushman gangs with the most modern weapons. The first consignment of "Stingers" has now been dispatched to the DRA.

All this is a manifestation of, first, Washington's highly shortsighted policy and, second, the extreme hypocrisy of certain representatives of the administration. Washington's words and deeds never coincide -- neither in Afghanistan, nor in Nicaragua, nor in South America, nor in the Near East. America has declared war on all and sundry. Washington wages war even on existing treaties -- the SALT and ABM treaties.

I would like to remind Mr Adelman that in Reykjavik we put on the conference table a whole package of proposals which cannot be separated from one another. Yet that is precisely what he is trying to do. It is totally impossible to consider offensive and defensive weapons separately at disarmament talks. That is an old truth, but Washington still has not mastered it. The claim that SDI is a defensive shield, not an offensive weapon, is a lie.

You cannot reduce strategic offensive arms while, in parallel, opening the way to SDI. The comparison which Mr Adelman makes with a gas mask is very lame. It was not only soldiers sitting in the trenches waiting for a poison gas attack who were armed with gas masks, but also those who went into the attack and used gas: Look at the photographic documents from the time of World War I. My generation is familiar with a whole range of toxic gases: chlorine, phosgene, diphosgene, mustard gas, and so forth, from lessons about antichemical defense in the thirties. Suppose my gas mask is only effective against chlorine: Does that do anything to increase my security? Especially since the enemy doubtless knows that my gas mask is only effective against chlorine. Naturally, in an attack he will use some other gas, and the gas mask will be useless. The same applies to SDI: It is not effective against cruise missiles or against aircraft. (And by the way, today the United States can reach us and we can reach America with cruise missiles and aircraft.) So the most that will happen in the event of the implementation of the SDI project is that the arms race will shift from the sphere of ballistic missiles to other spheres, perhaps to spheres which are more advantageous to the United States because of geographical factors. But that is precisely why we will not allow that turn of events. In a word, SDI is an illusion of defense, and nothing more. It can only be effective if the USSR sits idle for decades, taking no measures to resist, but unilaterally reducing its ballistic missile potential and even eliminating them totally. In other words, if we were to play into Washington's hands in every possible way in its anti-Soviet plans, then SDI could ;be expected to be effective. But the Americans can hardly expect that degree of "cooperation" from us. Without any doubt, SDI is an attempt all the same to find a means of waging nuclear war and winning it, despite all the President's solemn statements. At the same time SDI is a means of wrecking real accords on disarmament. Reykjavik showed that very clearly. You will agree: if all nuclear weapons are to be eliminated in the course of 10 years, why sacrifice this great cause for the sake of a weapon system which, in 10 years' time, will have no targets, since there will be no ballistic missiles?! The explanations we are given on this score are highly

unconvincing. Mr Adelman, echoing R. Reagan, speaks of a madman who could suddenly get hold of a few nuclear warheads and blackmail the whole world. But could a madman really get hold of an ICBM, no less? I repeat, SDI is only any use against an ICBM. This madman could, at best, get hold of an aircraft or try to carry an atom bomb in a suitcase -- the American troops in Europe already have knapsack nuclear devices. SDI would not save you from either of those. In a word, these arguments of Adelman's are evidently intended for simpletons. Mr Adelman justifies the creation of SDI by saying, in particular, that "the Soviet laser program is on a considerably wider scale than the American program." This claim is entirely unsupported, and the method is not new: The arms race has always fed on the fanning of the Soviet threat myth and false information about Soviet military might and Soviet military superiority. So I leave that to my opponent's conscience.

SDI cannot be a reliable shield, given the abundance of the most varied types of arms. But of course, its effectiveness will increase if a process of radical nuclear arms reduction begins. Here too the negative role of SDI is concealed, since it hampers arms reduction.

SDI does not presuppose disarmament, since it is itself another round of the arms race.

Now for Mr Adelman's proposal on "opening up" access for each other to special research centers or laboratories connected with strategic defense. In fact, we are in favor of this proposal. So where is the complication? We propose this verification measure so that both sides know that work to create [sozdaniye] new weapons is not taking place; but the Americans propose it so that the sides can see that such work is taking place. In this way Mr Adelman wants to legitimize plans to create [sozdaniye] SDI and make it "look good." In fact, the Americans have proposed the same thing to us in the sphere of control of nuclear explosions -- joint verification of the yield of explosions, not of their absence. This is a jesuitical method. Mr Adelman's proposals basically amount to a kind invitation to take part in the funeral of the ideas of disarmament.

One more thing. Washington swears it will share with us its achievements in the SDI sphere. This is rather hard to believe: We remember numerous bans by the administration on the sale of personal computers and other completely harmless technology and equipment to us. So who can believe promises about military technology?

Mr Adelman juggles very wickedly with the facts when he speaks of Reagan's proposals on nuclear arms reduction. Adelman was in Reykjavik and knows very well that it was not only the reduction of ballistic missiles which was discussed there. Questions connected with the reduction of strategic nuclear arms in general and also with the future of all nuclear weapons were discussed. After all, even if you follow basic logic: What point would there be in the USSR's agreeing to the elimination of all its ballistic missiles, if the United States had adopted programs for the accelerated development of bomber planes and the building of cruise missiles? Not to mention the existence of American military bases, which flank us on the European and Asian sides.

If Reagan had really raised the question in Reykjavik in the way that Adelman claims he did, he would not have been taken seriously. Nobody would even have formed the impression that we had come near to any accord. Mr Adelman has evidently joined actively in the unseemly game over Reykjavik which the administration has been playing in recent weeks. That is a part of the now customary tactics. First Washington proposes "confidential" talks, and then, having thus tied our hands and made us keep silent, it arranges leaks of information to suit itself. That applies to the Geneva talks too. But we will no longer play such games.

Mr Adelman fantasizes about a world free from ballistic missiles. If this only means free from missiles, and only ballistic missiles at that, but with cruise missiles, bombs, and other weapons, then such a world [mir] does not mean peace [mir]. It creates no guarantees against the nuclear threat. This might suit America. But what does it do for us other countries? So here too there is deception. A world free from ballistic missiles is the administration's utopian dream, and it does not attract me at all. In such a world we will not feel any more secure: Remember the second half of the forties and the first half of the fifties. We are in favor of a world free from nuclear weapons in general. We are in favor of the destruction of chemical weapons and the decisive reduction of conventional arms.

The hope of saving yourself, in the nuclear age, with the help of some technical trick like SDI is very naive. One American friend of mine said: The most terrible thing the Russians could do to us would be to explode all their nuclear weapons on their own territory. Then, he observed, you would have a merciful and rapid death, but we would die in terrible convulsions over many months.

We are living in the nuclear age, and we must learn to think in a new way.

/9604

CSO: 5200/1101

U.S.-USSR NUCLEAR AND SPACE ARMS TALKS

PRAVDA: ARBATOV REBUTTAL TO 18 NOV REAGAN SPEECH

PM201820 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 21 Nov 86 First Edition p 4

[Article by Academician G. Arbatov: "Not Just for the Sake of It. On R. Reagan's Speech"]

[Text] U.S. President R. Reagan recently delivered an anti-Soviet speech at the "Ethics and Public Policy Center." A speech which in some respects beats previous records for the enmity toward our country characteristic of R. Reagan. A bellicose speech exhorting a "crusade" and constituting a direct call to arms. A speech, moreover, which is inflammatory in the most direct sense of the word: The President talks constantly about the need to light something in order to dispel the gloom emanating from the "power of darkness" [nechistaya sila] he is exposing (that is, us) -- at least a candle, even better a torch, or maybe even a world conflagration.

The main theme of the speech is established in the first paragraph. It recalls the counterrevolutionary rebellion in Hungary in 1956. It says that the United States behaved incorrectly at that time. It should not have "stood by, hands folded," the President preaches. The sinister point of these historical reminiscences is obvious to those even slightly familiar with U.S. political history. There was a sharp polemic raging in the United States at that time. Some considered that it has been irresponsible to spend months inciting the counterrevolutionaries to revolt, creating in them the illusion that the United States would embark on direct military interference. Others branded President D. Eisenhower for not embarking on such interference, for not starting a war.

To avoid leaving any misunderstanding about what he is driving at R. Reagan swears to continue the armed interference in Afghanistan, Angola, and Nicaragua. He even promises to interfere in the Soviet Union's internal affairs. [paragraph continues]

As an example and model of American policy he cites bloodied El Salvador and violated Grenada.

No matter how you look at it there is only one way to interpret all this: U.S. policy is reverting not to 1956 but to 1918, when American troops participated in the ignominiously failed intervention in Soviet Russia. Fortunately for both ourselves and the United States those were prenuclear times.

Reading all this -- of course -- gives scant satisfaction. But this is what is interesting. You read and involuntarily think: We are being intimidated but it does not scare us, not only because people have already tried to intimidate us in the past -- including R. Reagan. We have gotten used to it, so to speak, because we are more confident than ever before in ourselves, our strength [sily], and our future. We do not shrink in the face of either threats or crude abuse.

The point lies elsewhere. It is all too obvious that the President is attempting to use thunderbolts of Biblical wrath first and foremost to embolden himself and his supporters, and at the same time to distract the attention of the public at large from the serious problems which have befallen the administration.

These problems have occurred in several spheres at once. In foreign policy there is above all Reykjavik. It really was a moment of truth and, as it turned out, was for that reason extremely uncomfortable for the administration as it revealed the yawning gulf between its fine words and its unseemly deeds. For 5 weeks there were attempts to build shaky bridges across that gulf. It confused others and itself, was evasive, and lied. Now, apparently, it has come to the conclusion that none of these attempts will work, that it must all be given up as a lost cause by simply erasing and nullifying the accords that were reached, and in an extremely crude form, judging by President Reagan's speech.

You do not need to be a seer to understand the reasons for this provocative behavior. They want to goad us into breaking off dialogue ourselves and burying the talks which have become a burden for them.

But in recent years the Soviet Union has learned a few things. There is no doubt that the U.S. Administration will not succeed in provoking M.S. Gorbachev or the Soviet leadership. The administration has failed to provoke not only the politicians, but even the people who write about it -- in particular the author of these lines, although, to be honest, I was very tempted to be franker in my words.

It is not just a question of Reykjavik, however. The administration now has other problems.

It lied scandalously in mounting the campaign of disinformation about Libya. Then CIA agent Hasenfus was captured in Nicaragua and "blabbed." That was followed by the even more troublesome affair with Iran -- a truly cinematographic story worthy of the Hollywood B-movies in which R. Reagan played the hero for many years. A story of secret arms supplies, secretly renamed ships, false passports and disguises, the conflicting evidence of incompetent officials, and by all accounts many other adventures which we shall probably learn about soon.

Add to that the election defeat, which won the Democratic opposition a majority in both houses of Congress. That clearly worries the President very much -- after all, his last 2 years in office promise to be difficult anyway. [paragraph continues]

It is not without reason that those years are called a "lame duck period" -- when authority and power wither away, supporters desert, and opponents become bolder. That is probably why the speech contains a very transparent hint or rather a threat aimed at the Democrats. Disagreement with the President means support for Moscow and the communists, and thus means treachery. The old McCarthyite ploy! A ploy used more than once by the Reagan administration, including at the recent elections, when there was an attempt to blackmail the voters by saying that anyone who is against the Republicans is for Gorbachev. But it was to no avail. They still voted against Reagan (it is a different matter that they did not vote for Gorbachev, of course, these were domestic American affairs that were being settled). As for the future -- we shall see.

The administration is confronted with other complications, perhaps not so obvious, but ultimately more serious. The stormclouds are gathering in the economy. America is becoming the world's biggest debtor. It also has the world's biggest trade deficit. All this is to a large extent due to excessive military expenditure. Things are also going wrong in the scientific and technical sphere, although the President in his speech laid it on thick when describing the country's triumphs in that sphere. In fact, U.S. competitiveness is getting weaker every year in the "high technology" sphere (computers, instruments, communications facilities, aerospace industry products, and so forth). Whereas in 1980 the U.S. exports in that sphere exceeded imports by 27 billion dollars, last year the figure had fallen to 4 billion dollars. This year it will, alas, go into the red -- the value of U.S. high technology imports will exceed the value of exports by 2 billion dollars, again, it is believed, because of the militarization of the scientific and technical potential, which is bringing less and less economic benefit.

In short, things are going badly for President Reagan, unusually badly even -- for in recent years, it has to be said, he has been amazingly lucky.

This, I think, is the main explanation for the 18 November speech. He did not make the political and rhetorical shift just for the sake of it -- the administration was completely pinned down by circumstances largely of its own making.

But Washington is reluctant to admit this, so it decided to find a scapegoat. Given the political views of the current administration, it did not take long to find one. It is, of course, the Soviet Union. They tried to transfer the mounting discontent to it, to the "external enemy." Perhaps the real problems would be forgotten and it would be possible to take people back to the cartoon world of the "empire of good" which always conquers the "empire of evil."

The fine role of positive hero in this political cartoon was not envisaged for the President himself -- maybe he was not told this. All that R. Reagan said on 18 November creates the impression that he is reverting to his original occupation of provincial "ideologue" schooled in anticommunist falsifications and "quotations" drawn from who knows where (like the endlessly repeated "10 commandments of Nikolay Lenin," which were drawn from a pamphlet fabricated back in World War II by Goebbels' department).

I am not going to guess whether this cunning political ruse will work again, whether Americans will be fobbed off with pseudoproblems instead of real problems. Anything can happen in America. But even there everything runs its course eventually.

And I am not going to follow bad examples and interfere in U.S. internal affairs.

Reagan's speech is of interest to us inasmuch as it concerns us. The switch from talks to unbridled anti-Sovietism poses certain questions for the Soviet Union too. Above all there is the question of yet another deficiency of the United States, the deficiency of its basic reliability as a partner. In my view, we in Moscow must now seriously consider how we should view the U.S. President's word. In Reykjavik he all but sealed with his signature an accord on the complete elimination of nuclear arms. Yet just over a month later, he has not only renounced everything but has also proclaimed a "crusade" against the USSR, making an agreement dependent on changes in our country's domestic setup.

Which is the true, the real President Reagan? Who are we dealing with in reality? Is there such a reality at all? Or is there just a kaleidoscope of different roles adapted to transient changes in mood and the political weather? Is the President now capable of action [deyesposoben] at all? Or is someone else -- or even one person one moment, another the next, depending on circumstances -- using him as a mouthpiece?

Many people in Moscow, both ordinary people and, I believe, also the policymakers are asking themselves these and other questions at the moment. Doubts are multiplying. I am saying this without a shade of exultation or gloating, rather with sorrow. Because we are serious about our relations with the United States, we have always respected and continue to respect the Americans, the people of that complex and difficult, but great country.

Although it would not be the end of the world [khot ne soshelsya na ney svet klinom], we would nonetheless prefer our two countries, confronted as they are with such a multitude of difficult and dangerous problems, not to waste another 2 years until the next presidential elections, or allow these years to become years of a further exacerbation of tension.

In conclusion, since in this speech too the President could not get by without references to the faith and religious values here are two quotes from Holy Scripture, especially for him, giving chapter and verse.

First: "...For wide is the gate, and broad is the way, that leadeth to destruction...yet strait is the gate, and narrow is the way, which leadeth unto life." (Matthew 7: 13, 14).

And second: "Can two walk together, except they be agreed?" (Amos 3:3).

/9604

CSO: 5200/1101

U.S.-USSR NUCLEAR AND SPACE ARMS TALKS

USSR: ADMIRAL SIDOROV AT VLADIVOSTOK PARADE ON ARMS ISSUES

OW072250 Vladivostok Domestic Service in Russian 0007 GMT 7 Nov 86

[Speech by Admiral Vladimir Vasilyevich Sidorov, commander of the Pacific Fleet, at the Vladivostok military parade and demonstration of working people devoted to the 69th anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution--live]

[Excerpts] Comrade sailors and soldiers, petty officers and sergeants, warrant officers and ensigns; comrade officers, admirals, and generals; working people of order-bearing Maritime Kray and Vladivostok City; revolution, war, and labor veterans; esteemed guests from the SRV and the DPRK. On behalf of and on instruction from the Maritime CPSU Kraykom, the Maritime Krayispolkom, and the military councils of the Red Banner Pacific Fleet and the Red Banner Pacific Border District, I greet and congratulate you on the national holiday--the 69th anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution.

Comrades, our country is the banner-bearer of peace in the world. The victory of the October Revolution, the establishment of the world socialist system, and the formation and strengthening of the socialist community led to a fundamental change in the correlation of forces in the international arena to the advantage of peoples struggling for social progress, democracy, national freedom, and peace. Today the entire planet is discussing the results of the Soviet-U.S. summit meeting in Reykjavik. It became a major political event in international life and for the struggle against the arms race, for banning and eliminating nuclear arms, and for averting the threat of war from mankind. The consequences of this event will have repercussions on international relations for a long time. Mankind has become convinced that elimination of the nuclear threat is feasible and possible. At the same time, the meeting showed the unwillingness of the U.S. Administration to take practical steps on the road to a nuclear-free world. It is responsible for the non-adoption of historic decisions offered by the USSR's far-reaching and interdependent proposals. Having developed an unprecedentedly large-scale arms race, the United States openly lays claim to world domination, and creates new hotbeds of conflicts and military danger, placing world civilization on the brink of a nuclear disaster. Under such conditions, the CPSU is doing its utmost to ensure that the Soviet Armed Forces are at a level that prevents the strategic superiority of the imperialist forces, improves the Soviet state's defensive capabilities, and strengthens the military alliance of the fraternal socialist countries' armies.

The Soviet people are redoubling their labor efforts to strengthen the country's economic potential and its defensive potentialities and are making a decisive contribution to the realization of the prospects for a nuclear-free world. The Army and navy servicemen respond to the party's people's constant care by making new achievements in their military work. Boundlessly devoted to the communist party and the Soviet people, Pacific Ocean sailors, the Far East soldiers and borderguards are ready to repel any aggression, wherever it comes from. The CPSU Central Committee and the Soviet people can rest assured that the state interests of the country of the Great October Revolution and its sacred borders are defended reliably.

/9604

CSO: 5200/1101

U.S.-USSR NUCLEAR AND SPACE ARMS TALKS

TASS: UN REPRESENTATIVE TO ASSEMBLY ON REYKJAVIK, MORATORIUM

LD110210 Moscow TASS in English 0005 GMT 11 Oct 86

[Text] New York October 11 TASS -- For the Strengthening of the United Nations Role in the Nuclear and Space Age [subhead]

The discussion of the question of enhancing the efficiency of the United Nations functioning was started by the 41st session of the United Nations General Assembly on Friday.

Deputy head of the USSR delegation, USSR Deputy Foreign Minister Vladimir Petrovskiy pointed to the increased role and importance of the United Nations Organization in the present nuclear and space age when the very existence of civilisation on earth is threatened. The United Nations Organisation is a unique centre for coordinating actions of states for the sake of aims of entire humanity, for the shaping of collective wisdom and will of the international community.

New favourable opportunities open to the United Nations in the present atmosphere marked by such positive factors as the meeting of the leaders of the USSR and the USA in Reykjavik, the extension of the unilateral Soviet moratorium on nuclear explosions: The United Nations can muster its entire efforts and use its entire authority to ensure that the world becomes juster and safer for all peoples. The United Nations' duty, the USSR representative went on, is to help overcome the negative confrontational tendencies that have been growing in the recent years, to clear the road to the termination of the nuclear arms race on earth and its prevention in space, to the overall lessening of war danger, to the establishment of confidence as an inalienable component of inter-state relations.

A still more important role rests with the United Nations in connection with the task of creating an all-embracing system of international peace and security, comprising the military, political, economic and humanitarian spheres. The United Nations is to play the historic role not only of the main mechanism for the creation of the all-embracing system of security, but also the main guarantor of its functioning in a nuclear-free world in future. It is necessary to realise the fact that the alternative to the United Nations activity is chaos in international relations, defencelessness against arbitrariness and omnipotence of force.

The Soviet representative expressed serious concern over the attempts to play down the United Nations' importance made of late by those who, instead of aims common to entire humanity, are guided by their own self-seeking interests, who replace many-faceted approach to the solution of acute international problems with unilateral attempts to impose their will on sovereign states by bringing into play their economic and military might.

U.S.-USSR NUCLEAR AND SPACE ARMS TALKS

IZVESTIYA BESSMERTNYKH-KARPOV BRIEFING ON GENEVA NST

PM281329 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 26 Oct Morning Edition p 4

["At the USSR Foreign Ministry" -- IZVESTIYA headline]

[Text] A briefing was held at the USSR Foreign Ministry Press Center 25 October. It was devoted to certain aspects of the talks between the USSR and U.S. leaders in Reykjavik. The briefing was conducted by A.A. Bessmertnykh, USSR deputy foreign minister, and V.P. Karpov, chief of a USSR Foreign Ministry administration and head of the Soviet delegation at the Soviet-U.S. talks on nuclear and space arms in Geneva.

The further we move away in time from Reykjavik, the more openly the mass media of a right-wing persuasion and U.S. Administration figures distort the picture of what happened in the Icelandic capital, and strive retrospectively to adjust it, A.A. Bessmertnykh stated, addressing Soviet and foreign journalists.

The United States is not only trying to distort questions connected with the character of the Soviet positions and the essence of the disagreements on the SDI program, but is also trying to give a completely false interpretation of the accords achieved. Whereas initially there was a fairly busy campaign there to appropriate proposals which did not belong to it, aimed at achieving a nuclear-free world, now there has begun a sort of disownment of the fact that these proposals were discussed and agreed upon at all.

A recently published official document directs government officials, to speak from positions set out in the document distorting what really took place at the meeting between the General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and the U.S. President.

The deputy minister noted that the grave danger has emerged that U.S. and international public opinion will be even further disinformated.

The U.S. Administration's document, he said, states that President Reagan merely noted the USSR's position about the fact that all strategic offensive weapons should be eliminated by the end of a 10-year period of cutting down on strategic weapons. Supposedly the talks were mainly about the initial U.S. plan which envisaged that, in contrast to the first 5-year stage, when, at the proposal of the USSR, all three elements of the strategic triad of both sides would be subject to a reduction of 50 percent, in the second stage only ballistic missiles would be reduced.

Thereby they want to create the impression that the content of the reductions in the first 5 years are one thing, those in the second 5 years something else. Where is the subtlety in that? In maintaining that in the second 5 years only ballistic missiles would be reduced, the United States would secretly like to exempt from elimination heavy bombers with cruise missiles and other nuclear weapons on board.

In reality, at the beginning of talks the U.S. side came out with the aforementioned proposal. Furthermore, during the discussion the President asserted that the idea of reducing only ballistic missiles in the second stage was brought up by the Soviet side, which, of course, was at best a misunderstanding which was immediately pointed out to the President.

After concrete arguments and reasoning put forward by Mikhail Gorbachev in favor of a radical solution to the problem of strategic weapons, which would not put beyond limits the elimination of other dangerous types of nuclear weapons besides ballistic missiles, President Reagan agreed with such a formulation of the question. He stated: 'Obviously we simply misunderstood you, but, if this is what you want -- all right'.

In the course of the conversation President Reagan did not object to a broader approach either, having given to understand that he is not against having all nuclear explosive devices, including bombs, battlefields devices, cruise missiles, submarine weapons, intermediate range weapons and so on scrapped by the end of the two 5-year periods. Moreover, he stated: 'If we agree that by the end of the 10-year period all nuclear arms are to be scrapped, we can hand this accord over to our delegations in Geneva so that they can prepare a treaty which you will be able to sign during your visit to the United States'.

It is the agreement of the U.S. side, registered in this statement by the President, with such a radical solution of the nuclear arms problem, proposed in the Soviet program of 15 January 1986, which made it possible to reach a mutually acceptable accord on offensive strategic arms in Reykjavik.

The U.S. President in the final reckoning showed the necessary sense of responsibility, A. Bessmertnykh said. But this did not occur in the discussion of the SDI issue.

And now in Washington somebody is trying to step back from the positions on which accord was reached in Reykjavik, to bring about an impasse on them and to cast a shadow over the President. The document I have mentioned and other evidence of a similar type speak of the fact that forces have stirred up which do not like the accords reached in Reykjavik which open up the way to radical reductions in the United States and the USSR's strategic arsenals and a nuclear-free world. That is indeed why efforts are being undertaken to confuse people. The final aim of those who are trying to place in the mouth of the President words which he did not speak, and take back words which he uttered, is quite obvious -- to halt the process in favour of nuclear disarmament which is gathering strength and which interests all the people in the world.

Replies were given to journalists' questions.

/9604

CSO: 5200/1101

U.S.-USSR NUCLEAR AND SPACE ARMS TALKS

USSR COLONEL GENERAL ON STRATEGIC WEAPONS, INF, ABM PROPOSALS

LD261953 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1530 GMT 26 Oct 86

[From the "Vremya" newscast; Commentator Georgiy Sedov interviews Colonel General Ivan Andreyevich Gashkov, deputy chief of the General Staff; Sedov and Gashkov, identified by caption, shown seated in studio; date and place not given -- recorded]

[Text] [Announcer] The USSR-U.S. top-level meeting in Reykjavik and Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's appearance on Soviet television have provoked a large influx of letters from television viewers.

[Sedov] The editorial office has prepared several questions and acquainted Colonel General Gashkov, deputy chief of General Staff of the USSR Armed Forces, with these in advance. So, the first question, Ivan Andreyevich:

As everyone knows, at the meeting in Reykjavik the Soviet side proposed to reduce USSR and U.S. strategic offensive weapons by 50 percent in the first 5 years and to eliminate them altogether over the next 5 years. This was confirmed in Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's speech on television. Are we not placing our security under threat, considering the availability of such weapons to third countries?

[Gashkov] The proposals for reduction in strategic weapons which were presented by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, CPSU Central Committee general secretary, in Reykjavik were considered in the context of total elimination of nuclear weapons on earth in accordance with the Soviet statement of 15 January this year.

It is obvious to the United States of America and the Soviet Union that, being the most powerful nuclear powers in the world, if over the first 5 years they reduced their nuclear arsenals by 50 percent they would not thereby place the security of their peoples under threat from third countries. The Soviet Union constructs its policy, taking into consideration the whole range of real factors, so that questions of reducing strategic offensive weapons are solved on the basis of equality and equal security of the sides, without attempting to conduct negotiations and reach agreements from a position of strength. Our state is not striving to achieve military superiority nor will it allow violations of the existing military-political balance. We are proceeding from the concept that when agreement is reached on reducing strategic offensive weapons by 50 percent in the first stage and the reduction is implemented, accords may be reached on third countries joining in the process.

[Sedov] Our country has agreed to the elimination of Soviet and U.S. medium-range missiles in Europe, leaving aside corresponding nuclear weapons of Britain and France. Will this not create unilateral military advantages for the NATO bloc?

[Gashkov] The NATO block would not get a unilateral military advantage in this situation. At the same time as the Soviet SS-20 missiles, U.S. Pershing-2 missiles and land-based cruise missiles would be eliminated in Europe. The necessary balance in Europe would be maintained with the sides' other nuclear assets, while the global balance in the world would be guaranteed by the approximate equality in the strategic nuclear forces of the Soviet Union and the United States of America.

We understand the seriousness of the solution we are taking upon ourselves: to leave aside and not take into consideration Britain's and France's nuclear potential. This decision was not easy for the Soviet Union, but its adoption emphasizes the Soviet Union's sincere desire to demonstrate not in words but in action our striving to search for ways toward accords on universal nuclear disarmament.

The reduction of the Soviet Union's and United States' medium-range nuclear weapons as well as the involvement of other countries in that process would significantly reduce the world tension and promote further improvement in international relations. Therein lies the political significance of the solution on this issue.

[Sedov] The U.S. Administration has declared that it is going to test SDI components, alleging that this does not contravene the ABM Treaty. What can you say on the subject, as a military man?

[Gashkov] The open-ended Soviet-U.S. 1972 Treaty on Limiting Antimissile Defense Systems has long stabilized the strategic situation in the world by holding back the race in strategic offensive weapons. This important aspect of the treaty is set out in its preamble, which says that effective measures for limiting antimissile defense systems have become substantial factors in restraining the race in strategic offensive weapons and would contribute to the creation of more favorable conditions for subsequent negotiations on strategic weapons.

As for the issue of tests, the treaty explicitly and unambiguously prohibits them. Article 5 of the treaty states, I quote: The ABM Treaty prohibits the creation, testing, or deployment of sea-based, air-based, space-based, or land-mobile antimissile defense systems or components.

However, as we all know, the United States of America plans to have space-based components within the context of the SDI program. All this is directed at violating and ultimately undermining the ABM Treaty, as has already been done with SALT II. The United States demonstrated this objective in Reykjavik, where, for the sake of SDI, they did not agree to strengthening the conditions of the ABM Treaty and thereby wrecked possible accords. Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev confirmed this once more in his speech on television.

/9604

CSO: 5200/1101

U.S.-USSR NUCLEAR AND SPACE ARMS TALKS

CPSU'S ZAYKOV TO LENINGRAD VOTERS ON REYKJAVIK, TESTING

PM110929 Leningrad LENINGRADSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 30 Oct 86 pp 1, 2, 3

[LENTASS report: "To Advance at a Faster Pace. Meeting of Moskovskiy Okrug Voters With L.N. Zaykov"]

[Excerpts] The process of renewal and restructuring inaugurated by the CPSU Central Committee April (1985) Plenum is gathering pace more and more actively and is becoming a part of every Soviet person's life. The awareness that we will not resolve the innovative tasks set by the 27th CPSU Congress without revolutionary positive changes is becoming increasingly deeply established in our society.

A thorough analysis of the changes occurring in the country in the postcongress period was made at the party Central Committee June (1986) Plenum and during the visits by M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, to the Far East and to Krasnodar and Stavropol Krays. The purposeful actions of the CPSU Central Committee, its Politburo, and the entire party are producing tangible results. The activity of the Communist Party and the Soviet state in the international arena has been marked by new approaches. At the Reykjavik meeting the Soviet Union attached paramount importance to the main questions of world politics -- ending the arms race, bringing about nuclear disarmament, and ensuring peace on earth.

Broad publicity, open discussion of the most burning problems, democratization of society, and enhancement of the role of the soviets are characteristic signs of the times.

This was said by participants in yesterday's meeting at the V.P. Kapranov Palace of Culture and Technology between voters from Leningrad's No. 48 Moskovskiy Electoral Okrug and USSR Supreme Soviet Deputy L.N. Zaykov, member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee.

L.N. Zaykov took the floor.

L.N. Zaykov's Speech [subhead]

Comrades!

Allow me to say a few words about international problems. The party's strategy of acceleration is most closely linked with the country's active foreign policy.

It is unnecessary to prove a truth that is obvious to every reasonable person today: Nuclear war is unthinkable in the present conditions, it is unacceptable, and it cannot be justified by any political, economic, or ideological goals.

But the threat of such a war is a reality that cannot be ignored, and must be overcome. The elimination of the threat of a world war and the achievement of universal security and disarmament -- this is the main objective to which the party subordinates its entire international strategy.

Many complex problems lie in the way to its attainment. The fundamental problem is the arms race, which was launched and is still being fanned by imperialism, and primarily U.S. imperialism.

Following the CPSU Central Committee April (1985) Plenum, the party imparted acceleration also to our foreign policy: It became even more enterprising, even more persistent.

Foreign policy is a sphere of activity where one cannot use statistics when speaking of successes and failures. Even so, one can say: Although we have not halted the arms race in the time since the congress -- no one could have really expected this -- we have still done very much to change the psychological climate in international relations and impart dynamism to the solution of the most important problems.

First, the USSR put forward realistic and specific programs for the prevention of an arms race in space and its termination on Earth, right up to the complete elimination of mass destruction weapons, radical reduction of conventional armaments, and the building of a reliable and fair peace on the basis of the principles of all-embracing security.

Second, the Soviet Union strives energetically, day in and day out, to ensure that its proposals become the subject of bilateral or multilateral talks, of broad and constructive dialogue between states, and of businesslike discussion by political and public circles.

We are not just talking about slowing down the arms race, we are actually doing it. That is the point of the prolonged Soviet moratorium on nuclear explosions. At the same time, the U.S. refusal to end nuclear tests shows the whole world the essence of official Washington policy -- it pays lip service to disarmament but in fact favors armament.

The Soviet-U.S. summit meeting in Reykjavik was a major political event in international life and in the struggle against the arms race, for the prohibition and elimination of nuclear weapons, and for averting the threat of a nuclear catastrophe from mankind.

The Soviet people ardently approve Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's activity at the Reykjavik meeting. Our position at the talks with the U.S. President combined firmness on principles with constructiveness in the search for the necessary solutions. Unfortunately, it was not possible to embody in accords binding on the sides the consensus that was virtually reached on questions of strategic weapons and medium-range missiles. The reason is now known to the whole world: The Washington administration's stubborn desire to attain the unattainable -- to achieve military superiority over the Soviet Union and work on the militarization of space through SDI.

Through the lips of the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, the party constantly explains to the world the sheer perniciousness and danger of this course. The Soviet Union has put the maximum good will into its peace proposals. We are not withdrawing them; they remain in force.

Every Soviet person is well aware that victory in the struggle for peace does not depend just on the efforts of our diplomacy. It depends also on the strengthening of our defense capability and on the successful implementation of the entire strategy for the acceleration of the country's socioeconomic development.

The stronger our forces are, the greater the Soviet state's prestige in the international arena will be and the more powerful the means of influencing the processes taking place in the world will be.

Lots of work lies ahead of us. We are well aware of our tasks and we know the way to resolve them.

/9604

CSO: 5200/1101

U.S.-USSR NUCLEAR AND SPACE ARMS TALKS

MOSCOW: JAPAN'S WORDS, ACTS ON REYKJAVIK TALKS CONTRASTED

OW120502 Moscow in Japanese to Japan 1200 GMT 11 Oct 86

[Text] Today the Moscow newspaper PRAVDA carries the following article by its Tokyo correspondent, Yuriy Vdovin:

The Japanese Government says that it welcomes the Reykjavik meeting and expects fruitful discussions there. Prime Minister Nakasone remarked that if the U.S.-USSR summit achieves specific results, it will be of great significance for peace and that Japan will work for the success of the Reykjavik talks if it is given an opportunity to do so. Foreign Minister Kuranari has said that Japan expects the Reykjavik meeting to deepen U.S.-USSR dialogue on arms control and other issues. The ruling Liberal Democratic Party feels that successful which are now showing signs of improvement.

The behavior of Japanese Government sources, however, indicates that they hold a strange view that the U.S.-USSR talks can only succeed if they are conducted according to a scenario prepared by Washington. According to newspaper reports, the Japanese Ministry of Foreign Affairs, for instance, plans to propose unconditional linkage over the issue of reducing intermediate-range nuclear missiles in Europe to President Reagan. The proposal is said to be based on consideration of not only Japan's security, but other nations' security as well. If so, why does Japan not demand that U.S. nuclear aircraft carriers and submarines and other nuclear weapons-carrying ships no longer make port calls at Japanese ports? If Japan truly seeks its security shouldn't it positively respond to the many proposals General Secretary Gorbachev made in his Vladivostok speech for easing tension in the Asian and Pacific region?

The Japanese People, together with all peace-loving people of the world, hope that the Reykjavik meeting will become the first step toward the total elimination of the danger threatening the world.

/9604

CSO: 5200/1101

U.S.-USSR NUCLEAR AND SPACE ARMS TALKS

INDIAN JOURNALISTS INTERVIEW GORBACHEV: NST, REYKJAVIK, SDI

Delhi TV Version

BK251647 Delhi Doordarshan Television Network in English 1620 GMT 23 Nov 86

[Interview with Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev by Indian journalists Nagvi, Balu, Joglekar, and Avashti in the Kremlin on 23 November -- recorded; Gorbachev's answers in Russian with superimposed English translation]

First I would like to say that I am awaiting my meeting with India with great interest. It will be my first visit to India. But perhaps that is not the special attitude toward India. In the Indian people we see our old friend and reliable partner. We are satisfied with how our relations are taking shape. I have already had occasion to say, and I wish to say yet again: Relations with India occupy a priority position in our foreign policy. I believe we can say that the foreign policy of the deep friendly feelings that our peoples have for the Indian people.

[Excerpts] [Unidentified Indian journalist] Mr Gorbachev, we followed with great interest your itinerary from Geneva to Reykjavik. These are landmarks of a sort. How do you see the road ahead?

[Gorbachev] You have asked the most important question, about which we are all concerned. I think a year has passed since our meeting in Geneva. And indeed, we can now come up with the certain assessments and evaluations, also mindful of what was done in Reykjavik as a milestone and our efforts to find ways of improving the international situation [word indistinct] peace and cooperation and also mindful of the responsibility that rests on the Soviet Union and also rests on the United States of America. I am convinced now that Geneva was important. I think without Geneva, Reykjavik would not have been possible. This is the first point. I am now convinced that Geneva was very important. Geneva made it possible to restore the interrupted political dialogue between leaders of the Soviet Union and the United States. This alone is very important. When there is a dialogue, there is a better understanding of each other's position. When there is a dialogue, the search continues. In any case this is the first positive thing that can be attributed to Geneva.

There were important accords there. I am referring to the final document. In it it was said: Nuclear war is inadmissible, there can be no winners in it. This is a very

important political statement. This is a reply to all those who dream or at least concede the possibility of small, limited, local nuclear wars. So, if the leaders of the Soviet Union and the United States admit that nuclear war is inadmissible, this is a very important starting point for the formulation of a new policy that corresponds to the nuclear space age.

There was also another important statement there: Neither side would strive for military superiority. So, if one adheres to this accord, too, then in any case both sides have to think not how to achieve military superiority but how, on an equal basis, to deal with disarmament questions and then the problems of the elimination of nuclear arms. So we stress the importance of the Geneva talks and decided on the acceleration of those talks. We also touched on several other problems concerning bilateral relations and I think that Geneva is an important milestone in international affairs.

The Soviet leadership has been faithful to the obligations undertaken in Geneva.

I want to confirm this with same facts. It is important to say something about this, because they have not lost their significance to this day.

After Geneva we extended the moratorium. On 15 January we proposed to the whole world a broad program worked out for 15 years for a stage-by-stage reduction of nuclear weapons and thereafter eliminating them by the year 2000. Apart from this, our proposals after Geneva contained very important ideas, in our view, on other issues of the struggle against the arms race as well. I am thinking of Stockholm: We put forward some very important and constructive proposals there. This made it possible to conclude this important forum successfully. We put forward major solutions which seriously moved things forward in preparations concerned with working out accords between the countries on banning and eliminating chemical weapons.

All this was after Geneva.

Finally, in summer of this year major proposals on reducing conventional arms and troops were submitted by us jointly with the other socialist countries. Even what I have cited is sufficient to confirm that the Soviet leadership acted responsibly after Geneva. But as regards nuclear weapons and the reduction of the nuclear arms race there have been no real shifts. Basically, they have reached deadlock. But we have acted constructively and responsibly in this situation as well. Taking into account the situation that has arisen in Geneva -- the situation of deadlock I'll say it again -- I suggested to the President that we meet without delay, leaving all other matters behind. What more important matters can there be, if what we are talking about is the fate of the world and the fate of human civilization!

It was essential to assess everything taking place in Geneva and to give these talks a new impetus in order to shift this whole process, the Geneva process from its standstill.

I must say -- we have evaluated this appropriately -- that President Reagan accepted the proposal. This, too, is important in its own right. We do not wish the Soviet Union alone to take the credit for everything. The meeting would not have taken place if there had not been the agreement and the desire for the meeting on the part of U.S. President Ronald Reagan.

After the end of the meeting in Reykjavik -- and you know how it ended -- at the press conference I said: For all the dramatic nature of this meeting, for all its dramatic

outcome, this meeting led us into new areas of understanding of issues and, above all, it has shown in a real way that accords, even on these difficult issues are possible. I reaffirmed this now. This constitutes the most important significance of Reykjavik.

I regret that our partners are causing confusion and muddle in people's minds not only in the United States but throughout the world with respect to the results of Reykjavik. This disappoints me. But it appears that the President is not free in making his decisions, nor, indeed, is the present administration.

I said, and I want to repeat it: Let the United States have pause for thought; let it weigh everything; let it make a responsible decision.

All our proposals remain in force. But we want -- and here I want to answer the second part of your question -- as far as the result of Reykjavik are concerned we want to go further, forward. The opportunities for this exist, they have opened up, the whole world has seen this and the world wants this. But we are being dragged backward. Dragged backward from Reykjavik. The U.S. Administration has even forgotten altogether what was discussed, or rather, gives the appearance that the discussion in Reykjavik was about something else.

But I have to say that in European countries also politicians have been discovered who have taken fright at such a speedy and powerful advance by the Soviet Union and the United States in the search for accords both on strategic missiles and on medium-range missiles. Now they again want to return to the whole thing that spoiled -- well, not spoiled, but at any rate rendered ineffective -- the Geneva talks. As we understand it, our -- the Soviet Union's, the Soviet leadership's -- main task is to retain the entire positive aspect of Reykjavik, and to complete the building, the bricks, which were deposited in Reykjavik.

[Unidentified journalist] It is claimed in certain circles that SDI is of such great, such crucial significance for the development of American science and technology, that it simply will not be the subject of negotiations. This is not my opinion, but that is what they are asserting and thinking in some influential circles. What is your assessment of this?

[Gorbachev] In general, every new weapon to some extent advances technical equipment and technology. This is, of course, quite elementary. For example, look at the development of jet engine, of jet aircraft, it was a very major stage in the development of technology. Look at the development of radio electronics. This too was a stage in the development of some military weapons but at the same time it meant progress in technology. This, I believe, is elementary. But I want to pose the issue differently. Let us think of the cost which the United States and the world must pay for the technological achievements which the present administration is expecting to gain by opening up a new stage of the arms race in space and by setting out to create [sozdaniye] space weapons which could bring the world to the brink of unpredictable consequences.

Can you, representatives of India, really agree to this? Can Indian people agree with this? We know that they disagree with this possibility. We know the firm position of India as described recently by Prime Minister Rajiv Gandhi. The Soviet Union too cannot accept this possibility. And I think that all right-thinking mankind cannot agree to such a price for the sake of the achievement by American industry and science of some technological heights.

Is it really impossible to attain these same technological and technical, scientific heights by carrying out a program of the peaceful harnessing of space? I am sure that this is entirely possible. Our latest experiment the Vega project related to the study of the Halley Comet and the planet Venus. I received our scientists here after the completion of their project and they told me what new frontiers in technology were reached by our science and our industry in the course of implementing that project and that experiment. New materials were developed. New achievements were made in radio electronics and electrical technology, in optics, in mathematics, in other fields. These are major achievements -- technical, technological, scientific achievements. That is what we propose, the Soviet Union, and we have put it forward at the United Nations. Let's do it; let's ensure a technological leap forward; let's ensure that we reach new technical and scientific frontiers through the peaceful mastery of space.

We are capable of making a competent judgement about all of this. To a certain extent we are on first-name terms with space; we have been working there for a long time now, and this includes cooperation between ourselves and India.

Well, if this is so, if it is possible to make technological achievements and to reach new frontiers in technology and technical equipment through the peaceful use of space and through mastering it upon a basis of international cooperation, then the question arises: Wherein, then, lies the real interest of the U.S. Administration in SDI, in the SDI project? Here it's not a question of technology at all. This is known by an enormous number of scientists both in the United States and throughout the world.

The U.S. Administration and the military-industrial circles of the United States once again want to overtake us, to break out, to achieve military superiority through space.

All those years that followed World War II America has been pursuing the objective of military superiority. It does not accept strategic parity, equal security. America would like to reach into space to achieve military superiority. As, I think Johnson once said: The nation that holds sway in space will hold sway on earth too. Politicians and representatives of the military-industrial complex are crazy about this. Herein lies the main question. This is something that we cannot agree to. Nor do I think that anyone can agree to it. If they try to present the SDI package in such a way as to make it appear that the United States will get the benefit here, that it will retain its technological and technical superiority over others, that this will bring benefit to the economy and ultimately to the people, then this is deception. In the years 1956-1976, as the Stockholm Peace Institute has indicated, the data from that institute [sentence as heard]. In those years the Government of the United States spent on research and development in the military area \$264 billion. And the number of patents, licenses, received was 41,000. Private corporation in the same period in the civilian economy spent \$176 billion. But the number patents they obtained was 897,000 for civilian purposes. SDI is a fraud. It is the attempt to deceive the American people -- all other people -- and some have been taken in by that deception. Some have fallen into the trap of that scheme. But it's not just deception but the main obstacle on the path toward those accords to which we were moving in Reykjavik. Now what could be the consequences of this Strategic Defense Initiative? This is indeed the crucial question, the question on whose solution really the further course of the negotiations on nuclear arms will depend, the further course of world development will depend. The question is whether the world is to enter a new stage in the arms race, through space, through SDI or the whole process of the arms race is stopped and the process of disarmament and eliminating nuclear weapons.

Thus, militarily SDI is a new stage in the arms race, it is moving on to new types of weapons, to space weapons. It is clear that this will not reduce international tension but will intensify it even more. To the Americans, they are trying to describe SDI as a kind of insurance policy, as something that will strengthen American security. But that is not true. This will not happen. Security will be diminished. It will be weakened, and this is understandable because the other side will be looking for countermeasures. It will find countermeasures, but that will mean a continuation of the arms race. Of course, in such conditions no reduction can take place. Politically, if the SDI program is implemented, then what sense is there at all in holding talks? Who will agree to easing the task of the military-industrial complex and the adventurists of militarism?

All this will make talks more complicated. SDI destabilizes the strategic situation and will not strengthen confidence, but rather will undermine it still further, will sow suspicions and uncertainty. It is a situation in which precipitate decisions may be made. The role of political leaders is very much in doubt when the arms race in space would be conducted. This is why both the Americans and the whole world community have to weigh everything about where SDI is pushing the world.

Finally, the economic aspect of SDI is of no small importance. SDI is a truly voracious being, a monster. According to U.S. data a minimum of \$1 trillion will be spent on it, and according to other data something like \$2 trillion. This will hit the United States; this will hit those countries which will be forced also to take part in this race. Ultimately, the problems and needs of the developing world will remain all the same. These are crying needs. It seems to me that the American people themselves, the Soviet people and the world community should reject this plan.

We are not afraid of SDI. We have considered what we have to do if the Americans continue with SDI. But this will not be our choice. The United States is pushing the world towards unpredictable consequences. The world should know this.

We greatly value India's stance. I have to say that the voice of peace-loving India in these last months of the acute struggle for where the world will go is a factor of enormous significance and is something of great value.

We know and value the position of the "Delhi Six." Incidentally, I want to say that we have received all their addresses and have given a reply to them. The Soviet Union shares the alarm of India, of all the "Delhi Six," and is willing to work together in the search for solutions to these urgent problems.

[Unidentified journalist] In your television statement of 22 October and in Mr Shevardnadze's recent statements there was a note of hope -- and optimism despite the U.S. Administration's attempts to depart from Reykjavik and to cause confusion, and despite the complicated situation. But I would say that your tone today was somewhat more disappointed. Am I correct? Today you are angrier, more indignant than even quite recently.

[Gorbachev] By my tone I wanted to convey my alarm. My standpoint remains the same. Like all my colleagues in the Soviet leadership, I am very concerned that the real results of Reykjavik should not in fact be drowned in a flood of all kinds of minor debates of little significance which have the aim not of leading this process on to a direct route toward a better world but of muddling the minds of the world public and of diminishing the results of the meeting. It is this disquiet that determines my tone.

But we are incorrigible optimists. We are dedicated to the peace-loving line and will do a great deal more in order for this process to be preserved and to promote it. However, as they say, a bridge has to be built from both sides.

[Unidentified journalist] You speak of the need for new thinking and for fresh approaches in international politics. We study these statements of yours with great interest. For instance, your speech in Vladivostok. How is this manifested in the USSR's policies in Asia?

[Gorbachev] An interesting question, an important one of great significance. Our new thinking as we understand it, is based on the realities of the present age. We are all in the same boat. The nuclear space age has faced all of us, not just some individual countries, with the problem of the preservation and the survival of mankind.

This is our common problem. In connection with this, in our foreign policy we appeal to the whole international community. This is our common task: to protect human civilization from nuclear catastrophe.

We should work actively to find new approaches in building international relations. This is crucial. I think that without the active participation in the process of construction of new international relations and by the peoples and countries of such a vast continent as Asia, this is unrealistic. For Asia consists of India, China and the Soviet Union and billions of people, many peoples and states.

Incidentally, after exchanging opinions with Mr Rajiv Ghandi, with whom I have talked on these themes on two occasions, it seems to me that between us there is this understanding: that however difficult this process is in Asia, and it is certainly not easy -- nothing must be oversimplified. One must not imagine it is an easy stroll. It is necessary to develop on this continent the search for new solutions along the whole front. We tried to express our own ideas about this in the Vladivostok speech. We are now intensifying political dialogue with a large number of countries of the Asiatic region. Of course, we count on the great contribution of India and also on cooperation with it in these matters. We are conveying our ideas concerning the Asian process also to China, and we have a dialogue with small and medium-sized states.

We recognize the right of all countries to an independent choice, to determine their fate, political system and state structure. This has to be the starting point. And in this respect we reject every attempted interference in the life of the countries, in the processes that are taking place in those countries. Some countries have long ago embarked on the road of progressive changes and continue along that road, and this is their right. Others are just beginning to move along that road and we know that this is very difficult because this involves interference from the outsiders, also internal struggle. We support the right of the people to solve for themselves their own national problems and no one can deny this right to any nation or any country. And we strive to see that our foreign policy in the Asian region is built on these principles. At the moment we are taking steps to increase and expand economic cooperation and cultural ties, to make them dynamic. I think we have expanded relations and our ties with many states both in the Pacific and in the Asian region. Of course, there are regional problems. We want a political solution and settlement to be found for them. On the whole, in my opinion, this will be a very difficult and long progress, but it is necessary. And I want to tell you once again that the way things would start moving in Asia will depend to a large extent on the overall direction international development would start moving. And I think that in Delhi we could have far more detailed discussions on [word indistinct] once we have an exchange of views with the prime minister.

Moscow TV Version

LD240010 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 23 Nov 86

[From the "Vremya" newscast, interview with Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev by Indian journalists Naqvi, Balu, Joglekar and Avashti in the Kremlin on 21 November -- recorded; Indian journalists' questions in English with superimposed Russian translation; journalists not identified on screen; video shows Gorbachev in conversation with journalists around table; Gorbachev is accompanied by Academician Ye. Primakoy and two unidentified men]

[Excerpts] [Gorbachev] First I would like to say that I am awaiting my meeting with India with great interest. It will be my first visit to India. But perhaps that is not the most important thing about it. The most important thing is that Soviet people have a special attitude toward India. In the Indian people we see our old friend and reliable partner. We are satisfied with how our relations are taking shape. I have already had occasion to say, and I wish to say yet again: Relations with India occupy a priority position in our foreign policy. I believe we can say that the foreign policy of the Soviet Union and of the Soviet leadership as regards India also takes into account the deep friendly feelings that our peoples have for the Indian people.

[Unidentified Indian journalist] Mr Gorbachev, we followed with great interest your itinerary from Geneva to Reykjavik. These are landmarks of a sort. How do you see the road ahead?

[Gorbachev] You have asked the most important question, about which we are all concerned. I think a year has passed since our meeting in Geneva. I am now convinced that Geneva was very important. Geneva made it possible to restore the interrupted political dialogue between leaders of the Soviet Union and the United States. This alone is very important. When there is a dialogue, there is a better understanding of each other's position. When there is a dialogue, the search continues. In any case this is the first positive thing that can be attributed to Geneva.

There were important accords there. I am referring to the final document. In it it was said: Nuclear war is inadmissible, there can be no winners in it. This is a very important political statement. This is a reply to all those who dream or at least concede the possibility of small, limited, local nuclear wars. So, if the leaders of the Soviet Union and the United States admit that nuclear war is inadmissible, this is a very important starting point for the formulation of a new policy that corresponds to the nuclear space age.

There was also another important statement there: Neither side would strive for military superiority. So, if one adheres to this accord, too, then in any case both sides have to think not how to achieve military superiority but how, on an equal basis, to deal with disarmament questions.

The Soviet leadership has been faithful to the obligations undertaken in Geneva.

I want to confirm this with some facts. It is important to say something about this, because they have not lost their significance to this day.

After Geneva we extended the moratorium. On 15 January we proposed to the whole world a broad program worked out for 15 years for a stage-by-stage reduction of nuclear

weapons and thereafter eliminating them by the year 2000. Apart from this, our proposals after Geneva contained very important ideas, in our view, on other issues of the struggle against the arms race as well. I am thinking of Stockholm: We put forward some very important and constructive proposals there. This made it possible to conclude this important forum successfully. We put forward major solutions which seriously moved things forward in preparations concerned with working out accords between the countries on banning and eliminating chemical weapons.

All this was after Geneva.

Finally, in summer of this year major proposals on reducing conventional arms and troops were submitted by us jointly with the other socialist countries. Even what I have cited is sufficient to confirm that the Soviet leadership acted responsibly after Geneva. But as regards nuclear weapons and the reduction of the nuclear arms race there have been no real shifts. Basically, they have reached deadlock. But we have acted constructively and responsibly in this situation as well. Taking into account the situation that has arisen in Geneva -- the situation of deadlock, I'll say it again -- I suggested to the President that we meet without delay, leaving all other matters behind. What more important matters can there be, if what we are talking about is the fate of the world and the fate of human civilization!

It was essential to assess everything taking place in Geneva and to give these talks a new impetus in order to shift this whole process, the Geneva process from its standstill.

I must say -- we have evaluated this appropriately -- that President Reagan accepted the proposal. This, too, is important in its own right. We do not wish the Soviet Union alone to take the credit for everything. The meeting would not have taken place if there had not been the agreement and the desire for the meeting on the part of U.S. President Ronald Reagan.

After the end of the meeting in Reykjavik -- and you know how it ended -- at the press conference I said: For all the dramatic nature of this meeting, for all its dramatic outcome, this meeting led us into new areas of understanding of issues and, above all, it has shown in a real way that accords, even on these difficult issues are possible. I reaffirmed this now. This constitutes the most important significance of Reykjavik.

I regret that our partners are causing confusion and muddle in people's minds not only in the United States but throughout the world with respect to the results of Reykjavik. This disappoints me. But it appears that the President is not free in making his decisions, nor, indeed, is the present administration.

I said, and I want to repeat it: Let the United States have pause for thought; let it weigh everything; let it make a responsible decision.

All our proposals remain in force. But we want -- and here I want to answer the second part of your question -- as far as the results of Reykjavik are concerned we want to go further, forward. The opportunities for this exist, they have opened up, the whole world has seen this and the world wants this. But we are being dragged backward. Dragged backward from Reykjavik. The U.S. Administration has even forgotten altogether what was discussed, or rather, gives the appearance that the discussion in Reykjavik was about something else.

But I have to say that in European countries also politicians have been discovered who have taken fright at such a speedy and powerful advance by the Soviet Union and the United States in the search for accords both on strategic missiles and on medium-range missiles. Now they again want to return to the whole thing that spoiled -- well, not spoiled, but at any rate rendered ineffective -- the Geneva talks. As we understand it, our -- the Soviet Union's, the Soviet leadership's -- main task is to retain the entire positive aspect of Reykjavik, and to complete the building, the bricks, which were deposited in Reykjavik.

[Unidentified journalist] It is claimed in certain circles that SDI is of such great, such crucial significance for the development of American science and technology, that it simply will not be the subject of negotiations. This is not my opinion, but that is what they are asserting and thinking in some influential circles. What is your assessment of this?

[Gorbachev] In general, every new weapon to some extent advances technical equipment and technology. This, I believe, is elementary. But I want to pose the issue differently. Let us think of the cost which the United States and the world must pay for the technological achievements which the present administration is expecting to gain by opening up a new stage of the arms race in space and by setting out to create [sozdaniye] space weapons which could bring the world to the brink of unpredictable consequences.

Can you, representatives of India, really agree to this? All right-thinking mankind cannot agree to such a price for the sake of the achievement by American industry and science of some technological heights.

Is it really impossible to attain these same technological and technical, scientific heights by carrying out a program of the peaceful harnessing of space? That is what we propose, the Soviet Union, and we have put it forward at the United Nations. Let's do it; let's ensure a technological leap forward; let's ensure that we reach new technical and scientific frontiers through the peaceful mastery of space.

We are capable of making a competent judgement about all of this. To a certain extent we are on first-name terms with space; we have been working there for a long time now, and this includes cooperation between ourselves and India.

Well, if this is so, if it is possible to make technological achievements and to reach new frontiers in technology and technical equipment through the peaceful use of space and through mastering it upon a basis of international cooperation, then the question arises: Wherein, then, lies the real interest of the U.S. Administration in SDI, in the SDI project? Here it's not a question of technology at all. This is known by an enormous number of scientists both in the United States and throughout the world.

The U.S. Administration and the military-industrial circles of the United States once again want to overtake us, to break out, to achieve military superiority through space. As, I think Johnson once said: The nation that holds sway in space will hold sway on earth too. Politicians and representatives of the military-industrial complex are crazy about this. Herein lies the main question. This is something that we cannot agree to. Nor do I think that anyone can agree to it. If they try to present the SDI package in such a way as to make it appear that the United States will get the benefit here, that it will retain its technological and technical superiority over others, that this will bring benefit to the economy and ultimately to the people, then this is deception. But it's not just deception but the main obstacle on the path toward those accords to which we were moving in Reykjavik.

Thus, militarily SDI is a new stage in the arms race, it is moving on to new types of weapons, to space weapons. It is clear that this will not reduce international tension but will intensify it even more. Politically, if the SDI program is implemented, then what sense is there at all in holding talks? Who will agree to easing the task of the military-industrial complex and the adventurists of militarism?

All this will make talks more complicated. SDI destabilizes the strategic situation and will not strengthen confidence, but rather will undermine it still further, will sow suspicions and uncertainty. It is a situation in which precipitate decisions may be made. This is why both the Americans and the whole world community have to weigh everything about where SDI is pushing the world.

Finally, the economic aspect of SDI is of no small importance. SDI is a truly voracious being, a monster. According to U.S. data a minimum of \$1 trillion will be spent on it, and according to other data something like \$2 trillion. This will hit the United States; this will hit those countries which will be forced also to take part in this race. Ultimately, the problems and needs of the developing world will remain all the same. These are crying needs. It seems to me that the American people themselves, the Soviet people and the world community should reject this plan.

We are not afraid of SDI. We have considered what we have to do if the Americans continue with SDI. But this will not be our choice. The United States is pushing the world towards unpredictable consequences. The world should know this.

We greatly value India's stance. I have to say that the voice of peace-loving India in these last months of the acute struggle for where the world will go is a factor of enormous significance and is something of great value.

We know and value the position of the "Delhi Six." Incidentally, I want to say that we have received all their addresses and have given a reply to them. The Soviet Union shares the alarm of India, of all the "Delhi Six," and is willing to work together in the search for solutions to these urgent problems.

[Unidentified journalist] In your television statement of 22 October and in Mr Shevardnadze's recent statements there was a note of hope -- and optimism despite the U.S. Administration's attempts to depart from Reykjavik and to cause confusion, and despite the complicated situation. But I would say that your tone today was somewhat more disappointed. Am I correct? Today you are angrier, more indignant than even quite recently.

[Gorbachev] By my tone I wanted to convey my alarm. My standpoint remains the same. Like all my colleagues in the Soviet leadership, I am very concerned that the real results of Reykjavik should not in fact be drowned in a flood of all kinds of minor debates of little significance which have the aim not of leading this process on to a direct route toward a better world but of muddling the minds of the world public and of diminishing the results of the meeting. It is this disquiet that determines my tone. But we are incorrigible optimists. We are dedicated to the peace-loving line and will do a great deal more in order for this process to be preserved and to promote it. However, as they say, a bridge has to be built from both sides.

[Unidentified journalist] You speak of the need for new thinking and for fresh approaches in international politics. We study these statements of yours with great interest. For instance, your speech in Vladivostok. How is this manifested in the USSR's policies in Asia?

[Gorbachev] An interesting question, an important one of great significance. Our new thinking as we understand it, is based on the realities of the present age. We are all in the same boat. The nuclear space age has faced all of us, not just some individual countries, with the problem of the preservation and the survival of mankind.

This is our common problem. In connection with this, in our foreign policy we appeal to the whole international community. This is our common task: to protect human civilization from nuclear catastrophe.

PRAVDA Version

PM241401 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 24 Nov 86 First Edition pp 1, 2

["M.S. Gorbachev's Interview by Indian Journalist"--PRAVDA headline]

[Excerpts] Mikhail Gorbachev met Indian journalists in the Kremlin on November 21 in connection with his forthcoming visit to India, and replied to their questions.

The panel of journalists consisted of Saeed Naqvi, Indian Television news analyst, A., Balu, special correspondent of the PRESS TRUST OF INDIA (PTI), K.G. Joglekar, special correspondent of the UNITED NEWS OF INDIA (UNI), and Harish Avasthi, director-general of All India Radio.

Mikhail Gorbachev: I would like to begin by saying that I am looking forward with much interest to a meeting with India.

Soviet people have special sentiments for India. We consider the Indian people to be our friends and reliable partners. We are happy with the way our relations are shaping up. I have already had a chance to say so and I want to repeat that relations with India are a priority in our foreign policy. I think we can say, too, that the foreign policy of the Soviet Union and of the Soviet leaderships with regard to India takes account of the profound sentiments of friendship our peoples have for the Indian people.

Question: Mr Gorbachev, we followed with great interest your journey from Geneva to Reykjavik. They are significant landmarks. What is your idea of the further road?

Answer: You have asked the most important question to which pertains all of us. Especially, in my view because a year has passed since the Geneva meeting.

I am now convinced that Geneva was very important. Geneva made it possible to restore the broken off political dialogue between the leaders of the Soviet Union and the United States of America. That was important in itself. If there is a dialogue, there is a better understanding of each other's positions. If there is a dialogue, questions are going on. Anyway, this is the first thing that can be counted on the positive side of Geneva.

There were important agreements. What I mean is the final document. It says, inter alia: Nuclear war must not be fought and there can be no winners in it. It was a very important political statement. It is the answer to all those who are dreaming about or at least recognizing the possibility of small, limited, local nuclear wars. If the leaders of the Soviet Union and the United States recognize that nuclear war is inadmissible, it is a very important point of departure for the formulation of a new policy that would be in accord with the nuclear-space age.

There was one more important statement: The sides will not seek military superiority. If we respect that accord, then, anyway, both sides should think not of seeking military superiority but of tackling disarmament questions on the basis of equality.

The Soviet leadership has stood by the commitments it assumed in Geneva.

I want to cite some facts to make this point. It is important to state this, too, because they have not lost their relevance today.

We have extended our moratorium more than once since Geneva. On January 15 we offered the whole world a broad 15-year program for the stage-by-stage reduction of nuclear weapons to the point of their total elimination by the year 2000. Moreover, our proposals since Geneva contain, we think, very important ideas on other aspects of the struggle against the arms race. What I mean is Stockholm, where we made constructive proposals as well. They made it possible to end that important forum successfully. I think highly of the significance of Stockholm. We furthermore substantially contributed to advancing towards agreements on the banning and elimination of chemical weapons.

All this has taken place since Geneva.

Finally, last summer we made jointly with other socialist countries major proposals on cuts in conventional armaments and armed forces. What I have just mentioned is enough to show that the Soviet leadership has acted responsibly since Geneva. But there was no real progress on nuclear weapons, on the scaling down of the nuclear arms race. I mean primarily the Geneva talks on these problems, which were virtually deadlocked. But even in that situation we acted constructively and responsibly. I offered the U.S. President, in view of the Geneva deadlock situation, to meet without delay, leaving aside all business. What business can be more important when the fate of the world; the fate of human civilization is at stake! It was necessary to evaluate what was taking place in Geneva and give a fresh impetus to those talks so as to get the entire process moving.

I want to note -- and we duly appreciated this -- that President Reagan accepted our proposal. This was important in itself. We do not want to take all the credit. There would have been no meeting if there had not been the consent and willingness on the part of the U.S. President.

Immediately after the Reykjavik meeting I said at a press conference: With all the drama of that meeting, it led us to new frontiers of the understanding of problems and first and foremost demonstrated that agreements, even on difficult problems, were possible. I stand by this statement today. That was the most important meaning of Reykjavik.

I regret our partners causing confusion and a mess in the minds of people not only in America but all over the world about the results of Reykjavik. It disappoints me. But the President and the incumbent administration as a whole do not seem free to make decisions.

I have said so and want to repeat: Let America think, let it weigh everything and let it make a responsible decision.

All our proposals are still standing. But we want to move on forward. There are opportunities for such a movement. They have been opened, the world as a whole has been seen them and wants that movement. But we are being pulled backward from Reykjavik. The American Administration has altogether forgotten what we talked about in Reykjavik, or rather is making believe that other things were under discussion there.

But there are in European countries, too, politicians who have got scared by such a fast and strong advance of the Soviet Union and the United States in their search for accords both on strategic and on medium-range missiles. Now they would like anew to return to all that which killed -- well, not killed but rendered ineffective -- the Geneva talks.

Our main task, the task of the Soviet Union and the Soviet leadership, as we see it, is to preserve everything positive achieved in Reykjavik and to finish the building the foundation bricks of which were laid there.

Question: It is claimed in some circles that SDI is so important, actually decisive to American science and technology that it simply cannot be subject to negotiations. It is not my view, but there is a powerful lobbying pushing this idea. What is your opinion?

Answer: Generally speaking, every new weapon advances equipment and technology to some extent. Thus, in my view, is elementary. But I want to put it differently. Let us think about the price that America and the world have to pay for those technological achievements which the administration intends to score by launching another round of the arms race and developing space weapons, which can lead the world to the brink of unpredictable consequences.

Can you, India's representatives agree to this? The whole of sensible mankind cannot agree to such a price so that American industry and science can scale some technological summits.

Cannot those technological, technical, and scientific summit be scaled through a peaceful space exploration program? This is just what we propose. The Soviet Union has submitted a well known proposal in the United Nations.

We are in a position to judge with this with competence. We are on the first-name basis with space, so to speak, we have long been working in the field, in particular, cooperating with India.

If this is so, if technological breakthroughs can be achieved through peaceful space exploration, through international cooperation in the field, the question to ask is what is the true interest of the U.S. Administration behind SDI? The point is not technology. Large numbers of scientists in America and all over the world understand this.

The American Administration and the military-industrial circles in the U.S. wants to overtake the Soviet Union to rush ahead and to achieve military superiority through outer space. America is not happy with strategic parity and equal security. Johnson said in his day that the nation which would dominate space would also dominate the earth. It is an obsession with politicians and representatives of the military-industrial complex. This is the crux of the matter, and we cannot agree to this. I don't think anyone can agree to this. Also, they are trying to serve this SDI

project in the packaging that the economy and ultimately the people will stand to gain. But it is a lie. Moreover, it is not only a lie but the main obstacle in the way of agreements which we were about to reach in Reykjavik.

Militarily SDI means another round of the arms race, a breakthrough to weapons of new types, to space weapons. Clearly, it will not lower international tension but push it up even higher. Politically, if the SDI program is carried through what is the point of conducting talks at all? Who will agree to make the task of the military-industrial complex and militaristic adventurists easier? SDI will destabilize the strategic situation and, far from strengthening trust, will subvert it even more. It will sow suspicion. Uncertainties will worsen. The situation which could develop would be fraught with rash decisions. This is why the Americans and the world community as a whole should weigh everything and realize where SDI is pushing the world.

Finally, the economic aspect of SDI is important as well. It is a truly voracious monster. According to American figures, at least one trillion dollars will be spent on it, whereas other estimates put the figure at two trillion dollars. It will hit America and those countries which will be forced to take part in that race as well. Lastly, the problems and needs of the developing world will remain. And those problems and needs of the developing world will remain. And those problems are crying out for attention. I think that the American people themselves, the Soviet people and the world community should reject this plan.

SDI does not scare us. We have thought out what we should do if the Americans keep working on SDI. But it will not be our choice. America is pushing the world towards action with unpredictable consequences. And the world should know this.

We value India's position very much. I must say that the voice of the peace-loving India in these months of pointed struggle over the way which the world should be follow is a factor of immense importance and a great asset.

We know and appreciate the position of the Delhi Six. I want to say, incidentally, that we have received all their addresses and replied to them. The Soviet Union shares the worry of India, of the Delhi Six, and is prepared to cooperate in a search for solutions to these urgent problems.

Question: In your televised statement on October 22 and in recent remarks by Mr Shevardnadze there was a glimmer of hope in spite of the American attempts to retreat from Reykjavik and in spite of the complex current situation in general. Today you are sounding somewhat more disappointed, I would say. Am I right? You are more angry, more outraged today than you were recently.

Answer: I would like my tone to convey worry. My positions remain the same. I, like all my colleagues in the Soviet leadership, am very worried lest the results of Reykjavik are really drowned in a stream of discourses, unimportant and trifling, the purpose of which is not to let this process emerge onto a straight path to a better world but to befuddle public opinion and detract from the results of the meeting. This worry explains my tone. But we are incorrigible optimists. We are committed to a peace-loving line and we will still do a good deal to preserve and advance this process. But, as the saying goes, a bridge must be built from both sides.

Question: You are speaking about the need for new thinking and new approaches in foreign policy. We have much interest in your statements in this vein, such as your speech in Vladivostok. How does all this show in Soviet policy in Asia?

Answer: It is an interesting, important and very significant question.

Our new thinking, as we understand it, is based on the realities of our age. We all are in one boat. The nuclear-space age has faced all of us, not just some individual countries, with the problem of the preservation and survival of humanity. It is our common problem. That is why we address in our foreign policy the international community as a whole. It is our common task to save human civilization from nuclear catastrophe.

We have now energized a political dialogue with many countries in Asia, with small and medium-sized countries too. We, naturally, count on India's great contribution and on our cooperation here. We are making our ideas of the Asian process known to China as well.

We recognize that every country has the right to choose independently and to decide its destiny, political system and state structure. This should be the point of departure. We reject any attempt at intervention in the affairs of countries and their internal processes. We see how difficult it is, always involving struggle and obstacles. We are on the side of the peoples looking for ways of resolving their national problems. No one can deny them this right.

Our foreign policy in Asia, too, is built on these principles.

There are regional problems. We want them to be resolved and settled by political means. I think it will be a very difficult and long process on the whole, but it is inevitable and necessary. Once more: the way processes will develop in the Asian region will depend to a large extent on the direction that will be taken in general by the whole world in its development. We can have a more detailed discussion of the subject already in New Delhi.

/12913

CSO: 5200/1133

SALT/START ISSUES

TASS ISSUES WARNING ON PLANNED PACIFIC TESTS

LD211819 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1746 GMT 21 Nov 86

["TASS Announcement" -- TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow, 21 Nov (TASS) -- Launches of carrier rockets will be effected in the Soviet Union in the period from 25 November through 30 November 1986:

In the region of the Pacific Ocean, within an area having a radius of 30 nautical miles of coordinates 22 degrees 35 minutes north, and 174 degrees 10 minutes east;

In the region of the Pacific Ocean, within an area having a radius of 25 nautical miles of the coordinates 19 degrees 10 minutes north, and 174 degrees 45 minutes east;

TASS is authorized to state that in order to ensure safety, the Government of the USSR requests the governments of other states using maritime and air routes in the Pacific Ocean to give instructions to the relevant bodies that vessels and aircraft should not enter these regions and the airspace above them each day from 1000 until 2300 local time.

/12913

CSO: 5200/1130

INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

USSR: PARIS STAND ON MISSILES, CONVENTIONAL FORCES VIEWED

LD160307 Moscow in French to France and Belgium 1800 GMT 15 Nov 86

["Notes of a Publicist" feature with Boris Tumanov]

[Text] Good evening listeners: Over the past few days, French politicians and disarmament experts have been making an increasing number of appeals to U.S. public opinion, begging them to bring pressure to bear on President Reagan so that he gives up once and for all any attempt to reach an agreement with the USSR on Euromissiles. The funny thing is that the French representative is today opposed to the zero option just as strongly as he denounced just a short while ago the terrible threat of the Soviet SS-20's and praised the virtues of this same zero option.

Mr (Pierre Leluche), deputy director of the French Institute of International Relations, explained this week to readers of the U.S. weekly NEWSWEEK that when all is said and done, the West has never seriously thought of applying the zero option, which, incidentally, he himself proposed, and that this formula was invented solely with the aim of dealing a blow to the Western antinuclear movement with their own arguments. And Mr (Leluche) said that in fact the only things in the world that would be capable of ensuring the defense of Western Europe were U.S. Pershings and cruise missiles.

The French foreign minister, Mr Jean-Bernard Raimond, went even further when, speaking to the British and U.S. press in Paris, he painted an almost apocalyptic picture of a situation in which the zero option would leave the Soviet Union the only country in Europe with nuclear weapons. This nonchalant certainty with which the French minister said such a thing mesmerized me so much that [words indistinct] effort to convince myself that France was still in its usual place on the European Continent. When a major power behaves as if these atomic weapons did not exist and tires to look for the protection of the United States in the name of all Western Europe, it becomes [words indistinct].

Well now, let's get things clear once and for all: Either France--whether it is in Europe or the antipodes doesn't matter--is able to guarantee its own defense with its independent nuclear force and, in this case, logically, it doesn't have to worry about having or not having to die for the defense of the rest of Western Europe, or else its nuclear missiles only play a secondary and subsidiary role in NATO's nuclear strategy--or, to be more precise, in that of

the United States--and in this case as well it is not up to French politicians and strategists to claim to preside over the destiny of Western Europe.

One [words indistinct] in France that the achievement of the zero option could leave Western Europe face to face with Soviet conventional forces. But France will always have its nuclear force so let her defend herself with it and let's not talk about it any more. As for the other countries of Western Europe, first, I think that as regards conventional forces, their armies are still slightly more powerful than those of Monaco; and second [words indistinct] the Soviet Union has placed its proposals regarding reductions in conventional forces in Europe on the negotiating table. The same is true for chemical weapons. So, it's [words indistinct] to break down open doors.

Reykjavik proved to us that a problem as complicated as that of nuclear disarmament, including nuclear disarmament in Europe, can in theory be settled. Now we are told that we must begin with conventional disarmament. [Words indistinct] It is very feasible [words indistinct]. But who guarantees, then, that should an agreement in this field be near, a Mr (Leluche) will not ask us in all seriousness that the Soviet Union should reduce the number of its crossbows--which as everyone knows are more accurate and more powerful than those of Western Europe. With that, it goes without saying that French crossbows should still not be taken into consideration.

If you remember, some time ago the West was saying that the SS-20's are the main obstacle in the way of disarmament, [words indistinct] at the time that one day, who knows [words indistinct] the West was going to attribute the role of principle obstacle [words indistinct]. Well, you know, it seems to me today that I wasn't far from the truth.

/12232

CSO: 5200/1128

CHEMICAL/BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS

AL-QADHDHAFI SAID TO BE SUPPLYING CHEMICAL WEAPONS TO SYRIA

LD231249 London SUNDAY TELEGRAPH in English 23 Nov 86 p 1

[By Defense Correspondent Simon O'Dwyer-Russel]

[Text] Colonel al-Qadhdhafi of Libya has acquired a lethal nerve gas warhead for his force of Soviet-built Scud-B missiles, giving his Arab allies the capability to launch devastating strikes on Israeli cities.

Highly-placed western intelligence sources say that the warheads contain a lethal "non-persistent nerve agent" and have been passed on by the regime within the last few weeks to Syria and Iran, both of which operate identical Scud-B systems.

The Scud-B chemical warheads could kill every human within an area of 25 square miles and render a city uninhabitable for about 24 hours after the attack, depending upon weather conditions.

Intelligence experts say that the Central Intelligence Agency suspected that Colonel al-Qadhdhafi had been seeking a chemical warfare capability for some time. That suspicion has been confirmed in the last few weeks by British intelligence services, who have traced the source of the nerve agent back to the Soviet Union.

The Soviet Scud, also known as the SS-1, is a vehicle-launched surface-to-surface missile with a range of more than 160 miles. It carries a nuclear warhead when in service with the Soviet Army, but it has long been known that there is a chemical warhead for it.

The Scud-B missiles in service with Libya, Syria and Iran do not have a nuclear warhead and, until now, were thought to be armed only with conventional high explosives.

The possession by Syria of a long-range chemical warfare capability will give it a huge advantage over Israel in any future conflict. Fired from the Golan Heights, a Scud-B armed with a chemical warhead could devastate the population of any Israeli city.

Intelligence sources said that Israel was fully aware of Syria's new weapon and that exercises had been carried out in nuclear-biological-chemical protective clothing. Brigadier General

Efraim Lapid, Israel's military spokesman, would not comment when asked if he could confirm that Syria had chemical warfare capability. His lack of denial is taken by NATO as tacit confirmation.

Iran may choose to employ its new weapon in a dramatic show of strength against Iraq in the six-year old Gulf War, perhaps by launching an attack against a provincial city or against Iraq's main oil export facilities.

The Iraqi capital of Baghdad (which has been hit on several occasions in recent months by conventionally-armed Iranian Scud missiles) and the main oil export facility at Kirkuk, both lie within range of a chemically-armed Scud fired from just inside Iran.

If Iran fired one against the Kirkuk oil complex, it could halt the export of more than a million barrels of oil a day.

NATO experts say that the technology for making a chemical warhead for the Scud is remarkably simple. Chemicals necessary to produce the non-persistent nerve agent believed to have been used in Libyan Scuds are apparently readily available on the international chemical market and could be easily manufactured in an adapted industrial chemical complex.

Iraq, for the last two years, has carried out a well-documented series of chemical attacks on Iranian forces in the Gulf War. The base chemicals for the weapons were brought on the open market.

Libya is too far from Israel for Colonel al-Qadhdhafi to use his Scud missiles against Israel. Military experts, however, see the possession by Syria of a chemical warhead for its Scud as "potentially the most dangerous military development in the Middle East in the last 20 years." There will be immense pressure on Israel for a preemptive strike.

As for Iran, an intelligence analyst said: "Iraq would not need to suffer many attacks by Iranian Scuds on major cities and oil export facilities before we could expect to see a coup to remove Saddam Husayn and a rapid end to the war."

/6091

CSO: 5200/4602

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

TASS CORRESPONDENT REPORTS ON NEVADA NUCLEAR TEST

LD150001 Moscow TASS in English 2343 GMT 14 Nov 86

[Text] Washington 15 November TASS--TASS correspondent Nikolay Turkatenko reports:

Another nuclear explosion was carried out at a Nevada test site. It was the 23rd American nuclear test since the Soviet Union had unilaterally introduced a moratorium on all nuclear explosions. A moratorium which still is in effect.

Judging by the fact that people in Las Vegas, roughly 150 km away from the site, had been warned by the authorities before the test to fasten their window panes, the nuclear device had a larger yield than usual. A spokesman for the test site actually admitted this fact as he said that the explosion, codenamed Gascon, set off at the site a tremor measuring 5.6 points on the Richter scale.

However, he refused to supply the exact figures and only said that the explosion had a yield of not more than 150 kilotons and that the test was arms-related.

Carrying on its nuclear weapon test program, the United States is demonstrating to the whole world its stubborn unwillingness to listen to reason and join the Soviet moratorium. To deceive public opinion, the administration keeps saying that it is doing everything possible to contribute to the curbing of the arms race, lessening the threat of nuclear war and even to the total abolition of nuclear weapons. But the fact that the United States conducts one arms-related nuclear test after another shows differently. The administration is persisting in escalating the arms race and continues to hatch plans to project it into outer space. Nuclear tests are needed precisely to improve the existing nuclear weapons and to develop new, even more dangerous systems, including nuclear-pumped laser weapons.

/12913

CSO: 5200/1131

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

PRAVDA REITERATES IMPORTANCE OF TEST BAN

PM181501 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 14 Nov 86 First Edition p 5

[N. Kurdyumov article under the "Echo of Reykjavik" rubric: "Common Sense Dictates a Nuclear Test Ban"]

[Text] Despite Reykjavik, on 16 October, just a few days after the meeting in Iceland, the United States conducted a nuclear test at the Nevada range, the 22d such test since the Soviet Union imposed its moratorium on nuclear explosions. According to a U.S. Energy Department report, another explosion is planned for the morning of 14 November. The administration is continuing its sinister deeds despite the peoples' indignation and protests. The assessment of West Germany's FRANKFURTER RUNDSCHAU is typical: "The shocking thing is the stubborn obtuseness with which Washington continues nuclear weapon tests."

Almost three months have passed since the Soviet Union announced its decision to extend its unilateral moratorium on nuclear explosions until 1 January 1987. This was a visible demonstration to the whole world of good will, sincerity, and a determination to halt the "nuclear fever" once and for all. At the same time, it was a concrete action.

In taking this bold step in a situation where nuclear explosions were going on in the U.S. state of Nevada, the Soviet leadership expressed the hope that political circles throughout the world and the world public would correctly assess the lengthy silence at the Soviet nuclear test ranges and that those people who insist on the endless continuation of nuclear explosions would still have time to see reason, to choose the path of realism, and not to miss once again a historic opportunity on the path of ending the arms race. The profound satisfaction with which the Soviet state's constructive action was greeted throughout the world convincingly showed that this appeal by the USSR meets the interests and aspirations of the whole world community and all sensible people, including the broadest circles of the peace-loving public in the United States.

However, there was a different reaction to the Soviet Union's urgent appeal in Washington and in U.S. Administration circles. There they are doing their utmost to dodge the Soviet initiative. Official Washington stubbornly refuses to end its nuclear explosions.

This line by the U.S. Administration was also graphically shown during the Soviet-U.S. meeting in Iceland, where, as is well known, the main proposals put forward by the Soviet side included a proposal to ban nuclear tests.

Facing acute criticism on the question of nuclear explosions both at home, especially in Congress, and from its NATO allies, U.S. representatives made every effort on the eve of the Reykjavik meeting and particularly since then to assure people of the administration's desire for "a world in which there will be no nuclear tests." According to J. Poindexter, the President's national security adviser, this is demonstrated by "certain changes" in the U.S. approach to nuclear tests.

But what do these "changes" amount to? Nothing. Just words. Essentially the U.S. side's position clearly shows the same old desire to postpone for decades a solution of the problem of banning nuclear explosions and to make the talks on this theme go on forever. It is no coincidence that a WASHINGTON POST commentator noted that the U.S. approach amounts to agreeing to discuss the question of a "phased reduction" of nuclear tests but at a pace which would make the complete banning of all tests a matter for the distant future. In other words, what we have here are clear attempts to use the talks as cover for a free hand in the sphere of nuclear explosions, particularly for developing the SDI program. The statement made on this score by Secretary of State George Shultz at a press conference in Brussels is indicative. Speaking about the U.S. agreement to a "phased process on nuclear tests corresponding to the reductions in nuclear weapons," he reiterated the administration's stereotyped arguments, stating that "so long as we rely on nuclear weapons as a necessary deterrent, we need tests to improve the reliability of these weapons, which is very important, and to continue the modernization of our forces." The absurdity of such an approach, which contradicts elementary logic, is obvious. The question is: How can agreement be reached on eliminating nuclear arms if the United States continues to improve them?

Nevertheless, the Reykjavik meeting showed that the problem of ending nuclear tests can be resolved. For that to happen it is necessary first of all to take the path of realism. As is well known, thanks to the Soviet side's constructive approach during the talks in Reykjavik an accord was almost reached on beginning full-scale talks on ending nuclear explosions.

The Soviet Union is not withdrawing its proposals, in which it invested the maximum of good will, including on the nuclear test question. This was reaffirmed at the beginning of November in Vienna, where our country proposed beginning without delay full-scale bilateral talks which should lead to the complete banning of nuclear explosions.

There is no time to lose. So long as the Soviet moratorium is in force, the United States has an opportunity to join it, as mankind demands. It is up to the U.S. Administration, and it alone. This real chance must not be missed. However, time is slipping away, counting off the days and weeks of the Soviet moratorium.

The realities of the nuclear missile age dictate the imperative need for urgent actions to save world civilization. That is why the attitude to the

question of ending and banning nuclear tests has become the convincing indicator of how seriously each of the major nuclear powers treats disarmament and international security and the cause of peace in general. That is why the recognition of the Soviet moratorium's significance and value is increasing everywhere and the U.S. unwillingness to join it and its striving to stubbornly work toward implementing the militarist SDI program and extending the arms race to space are giving rise to profound concern and increasing protests. For example, the FRG metal workers trade union, numbering over 2.6 million members, was among the many political and social organizations from various countries which recently appealed to the U.S. President to support the USSR's proposal to halt nuclear tests. The paramount task now is the struggle against the U.S. "Star Wars" program and for the conclusion of a treaty on the complete and general banning of nuclear tests--that was the main theme of a recent conference of the Canadian Alliance for Peace. Around 250 antiwar organizations and groups as well as the Canadian Labor Congress belong to it. Similar appeals and demands are heard daily in many other countries. They are made by politicians and social figures, scientists, and millions of ordinary people.

The elimination of the nuclear threat hanging over mankind and the halting of nuclear tests are realistic and possible. This is dictated by common sense. This is demanded by the peoples of the whole world.

/12913

CSO: 5200/1131

NUCLEAR TEXTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

TASS URGES U.S. TO DISCUSS TEST BAN

LD251022 Moscow TASS in English 0946 GMT 25 Nov 86

[Text] Moscow November 25 TASS -- Follows commentary by Vladimir Bogachev, a TASS military news analyst:

An analysis of the developments of the past weeks in the field of limitation and reduction of weapons shows that Washington has responded with a step back from its previous stand to every attempt made by the Soviet Union to meet the United States halfway in order to facilitate the quest for mutually-acceptable decisions.

That was precisely the U.S. Administration's reaction to the USSR's proposals that Soviet and American missiles be eliminated in Europe and they be drastically reduced on the global scale. The USA has also been departing from its own stand recently on the issue of a cut and then a total elimination of all strategic offensive weapons. They in Washington are trying to remove part by part the package of Soviet proposals, take from the negotiating table what seems more beneficial to them and disregard what goes against the grain with them for different reasons.

At Reykjavik the Soviet side again raised the question on the issue of the start of talks on a total ban on nuclear blasts. A ban on nuclear tests would strengthen the climate of confidence in international relations, would serve as an effective barrier in the way of unfolding the nuclear weapons race.

Demonstrating its goodwill, being guided by the wish to set an example to all the other nuclear powers, the Soviet Union has for fifteen months and a half now strictly observed the unilateral moratorium on all nuclear explosions. Over that period, the USA has twenty-three times thrown a challenge to world public opinion, by exploding nuclear devices in the Nevada test-range.

Wishing to justify at least in a way its stand on the question of nuclear blasts, Washington started talking of the need, as it claims, to reach agreement first on a stage-by-stage cut in the number and yield of nuclear blasts. During the summit meeting in Reykjavik the Soviet side proposed that talks be started on a total ban on the tests and, wishing to meet the USA halfway, expressed preparedness to discuss at some stage of these talks also the question of their limit number a year and the "thresholds" of their yield.

As a result of the Soviet initiatives the stands of the sides might seem to draw closer. Yet on that issue too, the Reagan administration began going back on its word, apparently reluctant to agree even to talks on a total ban on all nuclear explosions.

While continuing to confuse people about the results of the Reykjavik meeting, the U.S. Administration is now deliberately distorting the events at Reykjavik. Thus, in particular, they in Washington are trying to convince world public that the Soviet side has expressed full consent to the present-day U.S. policy of endlessly continuing nuclear blasts.

The Soviet Union is a convinced opponent of nuclear tests and, certainly, has never given any consent to an endless continuation of U.S. nuclear explosions. This has never been and could not be the case.

The world is now approaching a new important line -- the term of the unilateral Soviet moratorium on nuclear explosions will expire in five weeks. Washington has enough time to weigh soberly the consequences of its dangerous policy and consent to talks on a total prohibition of nuclear tests.

Nuclear blasts in test ranges should be ended completely and everywhere in the long run. This will seriously put off the danger of nuclear explosions over the cities of our planet.

/12913

CSO: 5200/1131

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

MOSCOW: GREENPEACE NEWS CONFERENCE PRAISES MORATORIUM

LD031519 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1405 GMT 3 Dec 86

[From the "Novosti" newscast]

[Text] A press conference, given by the representatives of the mass international organization Greenpeace, has been held in Moscow.

Reiner Jurtwig from the FRG and Florian Faber from Austria, described their organization which was set up in 1971 in the Canadian town Vancouver. Currently Greenpeace has some 2 million members in 17 countries. This public organization exists from voluntary donations of individuals which, in the view of its representatives, guarantees it independence.

Greenpeace campaigns for environment protection, against the arms race, and for the strengthening of peace and of cooperation among various countries. On behalf of their organization, the guests highly praised the USSR's efforts aimed at preserving peace.

Florian Faber said, in particular:

[Begin Faber recording in German with superimposed Russian translation] We welcome the Soviet moratorium on nuclear tests, declared on 6 August 1985. This act of goodwill has special significance, since it represents a concrete step, comprehensible to everyone, toward curbing the arms race. It is important that the Soviet Government and people do not just talk peace, but also act in its interests. This is why we call on all countries to follow the USSR's example. [end recording]

/12913

CSO: 5200/1131

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

BRIEFS

PRAVDA ON MURUROA TEST--Paris, 26 November--The press here reports that France conducted a nuclear explosion on Mururoa atoll in the Pacific last 13 November. The information on this has been confirmed by seismological stations in New Zealand and Australia. The French Communist Party, the French peace movement, the General Labor Confederation, and other mass organizations in the country and individuals are urging the French Government to cease nuclear weapons tests immediately and join the unilateral Soviet moratorium on all nuclear explosions. [Own Correspondent V. Bolshakov report: "Explosions on Atoll"] [Text] [Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 27 Nov 86 First Edition p 5 PM] /12913

CSO: 5200/1131

RELATED ISSUES

GORBACHEV TRIP TO INDIA: STATEMENTS, MEDIA COVERAGE ON ARMS ISSUES

Pretrip Press Briefing

LD231655 Moscow TASS in English 1639 GMT 23 Nov 86

[Excerpts] New Delhi November 23 TASS -- TASS special correspondents Vladimir Baydashi Aleksandr Belikov, Leonid Kotov and Gennadiy Shishkin report: The soviet information centre went into operation for the time of the official friendly visit to India by Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, here today.

Albert Vlasov, first deputy head of the propaganda department of the CPSU Central Committee, Academicians Georgiy Arbatov, Yevgeniy Primakov, Roald Sagdeyev, and Valentin Falin, chairman of the NOVOSTI PRESS AGENCY board, spoke to India and foreign correspondents.

The speakers paid much attention to the issues of removing the nuclear threat and ending the arms race. One of the correspondents put this question: The Soviet moratorium on nuclear explosions, which has already been repeatedly extended, expires approximately in a month. What are the Soviet side's plans in relations to this?

The participants in the press conference noted that for a year and four months our country has not been conducting unilaterally nuclear tests whereas the United States set off twenty three nuclear blasts over that period and is in preparation for the 24th one.

The issue how long can our country allow itself to refrain from tests at the time when the United States is going ahead with its nuclear testing programme is under serious debate in the Soviet Union. An uneasy decision is to be made. And what this decision can be largely depends on public opinion and to a no small extent on the Non-Aligned Movement.

Ending nuclear tests is the pivotal issue of disarmament since it is the basis for driving up the qualitative arms race. It was stressed that the Soviet moratorium had already had an important role to play. It dispelled a whole number of conceived myths. One of them is the fiction that nuclear tests can allegedly not be banned because this ban is unverifiable. It turned out that the fact of carrying out any tests can be established.

The joint experiment conducted by Soviet and U.S. scientists in Semipalatinsk showed that explosions with an yield as small as several hundred tonnes can be picked up. The

legend that continued tests were needed to make sure existing warheads worked properly was also destroyed.

It is perfectly clear that continued tests play into the hands of only those who are bent on developing new and new types of nuclear armaments, including for waging "Star wars".

In the West they contend that the Soviet Union opposes the "Star Wars" because technologically it lags behind the United States. Is it really so, an Indian journalist queried.

It is well-known that for a definite period of time now the United States has not had the possibility to place into orbit space objects which is explained to a no small extent by the disaster which struck the U.S. spaceship "Challenger", the journalist was answered. Meanwhile, the Soviet Union developed the orbital station "Mir" which is a new-generation station after "Salyut".

The permanently operating orbital station has actually been created now, which thanks to the modular character of its design can be enlarged and acquire new configuration, which the world would be able to see for itself in the near future.

In these conditions, Academician Sagdeyev stressed, it is absurd to speak of some technical lag of the Soviet Union.

Gorbachev Arrival Statement

LD250735 Moscow TASS in English 0731 GMT 25 Nov 86

[Excerpts] New Delhi November 25 TASS -- Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, has arrived in New Delhi today on an official friendly visit at the invitation of Prime Minister Of India Rajiv Gandhi and the Indian Government. Upon his arrival he has made the following statement:

"Following an upward trend, these relations have been at all stages a factor of international stability and peace. This is how it was in the past and this is how it is nowadays.

"At the present stage when both the Soviet Union and India tackle large-scale tasks of their internal development, the tasks of historical importance, Soviet-Indian ties and contacts are in need of being lent a still greater dynamism.

"This is also essential to world politics in the present-day complex and dangerous international situation.

"The problems mankind is now faced with are immense, and the dangers confronting mankind are great: the nuclear threat and the problem of survival, the difficulties and misfortunes of the developing countries, West-East, North-South -- i.e. contradictions between various types of socio-political systems and the levels of their development, regional and inter-nation crises and conflicts, the problems of food, energy, and the environment".

"I think that all these complexities of the present-day world will be touched upon in this or that degree in our conversations and talks.

"And, of course, matters of Soviet-Indian relations in all their aspects, and the topical problems of Asia, the Indian and Pacific Ocean regions will be the focus of attention -- in the context of the struggle to prevent nuclear war and improve the entire international situation.

Gandhi Welcoming Speech

LD251017 Moscow TASS in English 0959 GMT 25 Nov 86

[Excerpts New Delhi November 25 TASS -- Greeting Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and the people accompanying him at Delhi airport, the prime minister of India, Rajiv Gandhi, said:

"General Secretary Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, madame Raisa Gorbacheva, our friends from the Soviet Union.

In India, as in the Soviet Union change is being pushed forward without continuity being disturbed. In both our countries, the principles and values of our national endeavour are firmly rooted and well established. Therefore with confidence and conviction we have each been able to give new directions and new dimensions to our policies. Nation building is a continuous process, there must be an adaptation of past perspectives to present realities. Innovation, imagination and an alert awareness of evolving circumstances constitute the lifebreath of a dynamic society. The serious experience of war in this century has seasoned the Soviet Union's stake in enduring peace. India's heritage of tolerance, harmony, and non-violence has cast us in the role of pioneers of peace. You respect our nonalignment, we respect your consistent commitment to peace. We share a firm belief in nuclear disarmament as the essential precursor of a peace that is durable and guaranteed. For thirty years we have worked together for harmony in the world and for the welfare of our peoples. We are delighted to have you with us, we hope this glimpse of Delhi will bring you back to us often and to many different parts of India.

Long live Indo-Soviet friendship."

Joint Declaration For Nuclear-Free World

PM031129 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 28 Nov 86 First Edition p 1

["Delhi Declaration on the Principles of a Nuclear-Free and Nonviolent World" -- PRAVDA headline]

[Text] Today humanity stands at a crucial turning point in history. Nuclear weapons threaten to annihilate not only all that man has created through the ages, but man himself and even life on earth. In the nuclear age, humanity must evolve a new political thinking, a new concept of the world that would provide credible guarantees for humanity's survival. People want to live in a safer and a more just world. Humanity deserves a better fate than being a hostage to nuclear terror and despair. It is necessary to change the existing world situation and to build a nuclear-weapon free world, free of violence and hatred, fear and suspicion.

The world we have inherited belongs to present and future generations and this demands that primacy be given to universally accepted human values. The right of every nation

and every person to life, freedom, peace and the pursuit of happiness must be recognized. The use of threat of use of force must be abandoned. The right of every people to make their own social, political and ideological choices must be respected. Policies that seek to establish the domination by some over others must be renounced. The expansion of nuclear arsenals and the development of space weapons undermine the universally accepted conviction that a nuclear war should never be fought and can never be won.

On behalf of the more than one billion men, women and children of our two friendly countries who account for one-fifth of mankind, we call upon the peoples and leaders of all countries to take urgent action that would lead to a world free of weapons of mass destruction, a world without war.

Conscious of our common responsibility for the destinies of our two nations and of mankind, we hereby set forth the following principles for building a nuclear-weapon free and nonviolent world.

1. Peaceful coexistence must become the universal norm of international relations:

In the nuclear age it is necessary that international relations are restructured so that confrontation is replaced by cooperation, and conflict situations resolved through peaceful political means, not through military means.

2. Human life must be recognized as the supreme value:

It is only man's creative genius that makes progress and development of civilization possible in a peaceful environment.

3. Nonviolence should be the basis of community life:

Philosophies and policies based on violence and intimidation, inequality and oppression, and discrimination on the basis of race, religion or color, are immoral and impermissible. They spread intolerance, destroy man's noble aspirations, and negate all human values.

4. Mutual understanding and trust must replace fear and suspicion:

Mistrust, fear and suspicion between nations and peoples distort perceptions of the real world. They engender tensions and, in the final analysis, harm the entire international community.

5. The right of every state to political and economic independence must be recognized and respected:

A new world order must be built to ensure economic justice and equal political security for all nations. An end to the arms race is an essential prerequisite for the establishment of such an order.

6. Resources being spent on armaments must be channelled towards social and economic development:

Only disarmament can release the enormous additional resources needed for combatting economic backwardness and poverty.

7. Conditions must be guaranteed for the individual's harmonious development:

All nations must work together to solve urgent humanitarian problems and cooperate in the areas of culture, the arts, science, education and medicine for the all-round development of the individual. A world without nuclear weapons and violence would open up vast opportunities for this.

8. Mankind's material and intellectual potential must be used to solve global problems:

Solutions must be found to global problems such as shortage of food, the growth of populations, illiteracy and environmental degradation through the efficient and appropriate uses of the resources of the earth. The world's oceans, the ocean floor as well as outer space are the common heritage of mankind. A termination of the arms race would create better conditions for this purpose [solving global problems].

9. The "balance of terror" must give way to comprehensive international security:

The world is one and its security is indivisible. East and west, north and south regardless of social systems, ideologies, religion or race must join together in a common commitment to disarmament and development.

International security can be guaranteed through the adoption of integrated measures in the field of nuclear disarmament using all available and agreed measures of verification, and confidence building; just political settlement of regional conflicts, through peaceful negotiations; and cooperation in the political, economic and humanitarian spheres.

10. A nuclear-weapon free and non-violent world requires specific and immediate action for disarmament:

It can be achieved through agreements on:

- Complete destruction of nuclear arsenals before the end of this century;
- Barring of all weapons from outer space, which is the common heritage of mankind;
- Banning of all nuclear weapons test;
- Prohibition of the development of new types of weapons of mass destruction;
- Banning of chemical weapons and destruction of their stockpiles;
- Reducing the levels of conventional arms and armed forces.

Pending the elimination of nuclear weapons, the Soviet Union and India propose that an international convention banning the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons should be concluded immediately. This would constitute a major concrete step towards complete nuclear disarmament.

Building a nuclear-weapon free and non-violent world requires revolutionary transformation of outlook and the education of people and nations for peace, mutual respect and tolerance. The propaganda of war, hatred, and violence should be forbidden and the stereotyped perception of other nations and peoples as enemies should be discarded.

Wisdom lies in preventing the accumulation and aggravation of global problems which, if not solved today require even greater sacrifices tomorrow.

The danger that threatens mankind is grave. But mankind has the power to prevent a catastrophe, and to pave the way to a nuclear-weapon free civilization. The gathering strength of the coalition for peace embracing the efforts of the Nonaligned Movement, the Group of Six countries and all peace-loving countries, political parties and public organisations gives us reason for hope, and optimism. The time for decisive and urgent action is now.

[signed] M. Gorbachev
General Secretary of the
CPSU Central Committee

R. Gandhi
Prime Minister of the
Republic of India

[dated] New Delhi, 27 November 1986

Indian Vice President's Speech

PM281751 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 28 Nov 86 Morning Edition pp 1, 2

[TASS account of speech by R. Venkataraman, vice president of India and chairman of the Council of States, at a meeting between members of the Soviet delegation led by M.S. Gorbachev and members of the Indian Parliament in Delhi 27 November, published under the general heading "Stability and Security in Asia -- Our Common Concern. Meeting with India's Parliamentarians"]

[Excerpts] General Secretary Mikhail Gorbachev!

Mr Prime Minister!

Mr Speaker, Your Excellencies!

Esteemed Members of Parliament!

Esteemed guests!

The community of views on global problems helps us to draw increasingly close. Both countries' leadership are resolutely against the nuclear arms race which threatens the total annihilation of mankind, against Star Wars whose objective is to pollute even outer space and to contribute to an escalation of tension. We also share the opinion that peace and progress are inseparable and that there can be no progress without peace. The fact that the Soviet Union readily and immediately responded to the six countries' initiative and your positive proposals on nuclear disarmament in Reykjavik fill the world with hope that these efforts will not be in vain.

Mr General Secretary, your visit to India is of unusually great importance not only for our two countries but also for the cause of peace all over the world. May our relations be always imbued with the spirit which has brought us together here. I would like to recall the words of Jawaharlal Nehru, who said:

"The Soviet Union has given us many valuable gifts, but friendship is the most valuable gift."

With these words, Mr General Secretary, I welcome you once more, and now allow me to ask you to address the members of our parliament.

Gorbachev Dinner Speech

PM281057 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 28 Nov 86 Morning Edition p 4

["In Honor of India's Prime Minister"--IZVESTIYA headline]

[Speech of General Secretary Mikhail Gorbachev at a dinner given by Gorbachev in honor of Prime Minister Rajiv Gandhi in the Soviet Embassy in New Delhi on 27 November]

[Excerpts] Esteemed Mr Prime Minister,

Esteemed Mrs Gandhi,
Dear Indian Friends,
Comrades,

Scientific and technological progress has reduced distances and turned mankind into an interconnected community. But it has also brought on new dangers and threats which are common to everyone. The main danger is posed by thermonuclear destruction of our civilization.

The situation imperatively calls for a new approach to the solution of security issues and a new thinking in politics. Whatever the contradictions which divide East and West, North and South, a common human interest has now moved to the fore for all states and peoples.

We are destined to survive or die in the nuclear-space age together. Anyone's imperial ambitions, nationalist egoism, political die-hardism or adventurism should not be allowed to push civilization into the 'black hole' of space non-existence.

My colleagues and I are deeply satisfied with the meetings and conversations with the Indian leadership. The talks were wide-ranging, frank and substantive, with an eye to a long-term period ahead.

A realistic view of the present-day world and its problems, mutual trust and sincere desire to broaden and deepen cooperation helped us to inform each other better of our vision of the present and of the future.

For quite understandable reasons, we representatives of the two great states gave paramount attention to international problems and among them to the problem which is the main one for all peoples and countries, large and small, irrespective of their systems; namely, how to remove the nuclear threat, to end the arms race on earth, to prevent its spreading over to outer space, to relieve tension, and to unblock conflict situations.

Joint Statement of Visit

PM281231 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 28 Nov 86 First Edition pp 1, 2

["Soviet-Indian Joint Statement"--PRAVDA headline]

[Excerpts] At the invitation of the prime minister of the Republic of India, Shri Rajiv Gandhi and the Government of India, the general secretary of the Central Committee of

the CPSU, Mr M.S. Gorbachev paid an official friendly visit to India from November 25 to 28, 1986.

The distinguished Soviet guest and the persons accompanying him were accorded a cordial welcome testifying to the feelings of sincere friendship and regard of the people of India for the people and leadership of the USSR.

The general secretary of the Central Committee of the CPSU, Mr M.S. Gorbachev called on the president of the Republic of India, Giani Zail Singh and had a friendly discussion with him.

Talks were held between the prime minister of the Republic of India, Shri Rajiv Gandhi and the general secretary of the Central Committee of the CPSU, Mr Mikhail S. Gorbachev, in which the participants were:

From the Soviet side --

Eduard Shevardnadze, member of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee, minister of foreign affairs of the USSR; Anatoliy Dobrynin, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee; Vladimir Kamentsev, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers; Marshal of the Soviet Union Sergey Akhromeyev, chief of the General Staff of the Armed Forces of the USSR, first deputy minister of defense of the USSR; Anatoliy Chernyayev, assistant to the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee; Yuliy Vorontsov, first deputy minister of foreign affairs of the USSR; and Vasiliy Rykov, ambassador of the USSR to India.

From the Indian side --

Narayan Dutt Tiwari, minister of external affairs, P.V. Narasimha Rao, minister of manpower resources, Vishwanath Pratap Singh, minister of finance, Arun Singh, minister of state for defense, Natwar Singh, minister of state for external affairs, A.P. Venkateshwaran, secretary for external affairs of the Indian ministry of External Affairs, and Triloki Nath Kaul, the ambassador of India to the USSR.

Mr M.S. Gorbachev had, in addition, separate discussions with Shri Rajiv Gandhi.

The general secretary of the Central Committee of the CPSU received the minister of external affairs of the Republic of India.

The general secretary of the Central Committee of the CPSU, Mr. M.S. Gorbachev addressed the members of the Indian Parliament who listened to him with great interest and attention.

All the meetings and discussions were held in an atmosphere of friendship, cordiality and mutual understanding.

An extensive exchange of views on a wide range of international issues once again demonstrated the coincidence or similarity in the positions of India and the USSR on major world issues.

The two sides reiterated their conviction that relations between all states should be based on such universally recognized and fundamental principles as renunciation of the threat or use of force, mutual respect for sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity, inviolability of borders and non-interference in internal affairs. Disputes between states should be resolved through peaceful means.

India and the Soviet Union are of the firm conviction that the most important objective facing mankind today is to strengthen peace and remove the threat of a nuclear catastrophe.

Proceeding from this conviction and determined to contribute towards the realization of this great objective, the prime minister of India and the general secretary of the Central Committee of the CPSU signed the Delhi Declaration on principles for a nuclear weapon free and non-violent world. The two leaders commend it to all nations of the world and urge them to do their utmost in the interests of nuclear disarmament and universal peace.

The two sides expressed grave concern over the deterioration in the international situation, continuing escalation of the arms race, specially in nuclear and other weapons of mass destruction, the growing danger of it being extended to outer space, as well as the persistence of existing hotbeds of tension and emergence of new ones. They were convinced that all states, irrespective of their size and regardless of differences in their socio-economic systems have a role to play in the search for realistic solutions that would halt and reverse the nuclear arms race and reduce tensions in the world.

The Soviet side drew attention to its program of complete phased elimination of nuclear and other types of weapons of mass destruction by the end of this century. The Indian side welcomed this major initiative.

In accordance with the Delhi Declaration signed by the leaders of the two countries, both sides called for an early conclusion of the convention on the prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons.

The two sides stressed the importance of a freeze on nuclear arsenals on a global basis beginning from a specific date and under effective verification. This should be followed by substantial reduction in nuclear arsenals. They called for an early prohibition and elimination of chemical weapons and for the prohibition of the development and production of new types of weapons of mass annihilation.

The USSR and India supported immediate suspension of all nuclear weapon tests and the speedy conclusion of a treaty on the complete and general prohibition of nuclear weapon tests. The Indian side positively noted the Soviet Union's readiness to sign such a treaty at any time and at any place and welcomed the unilateral moratorium on nuclear testing till 1987 by the Soviet Union.

India and the USSR considered important in this context initiatives taken by the heads of state or government of Argentina, Greece, India, Mexico, Sweden and Tanzania which are aimed at the termination of production and deployment of nuclear weapons and their delivery system, prevention of an arms race in outer space and the cessation of all nuclear testing, and making the Soviet unilateral moratorium at least a bilateral one.

The USSR and India are convinced that given political will, the elaboration of a reliable system of verification of the cessation of nuclear testing does not present any serious difficulties. Such a system could be based in particular on the recommendations of the Eighth Conference of Heads of State or Government of Nonaligned Countries of Harare and the relevant proposals by the countries participants in the six nation initiative.

The Soviet side informed the Indian side about the outcome of the Soviet-American meeting at the highest level in Reykjavik where proposals aimed at complete liquidation of nuclear weapons were put forward by the Soviet Union. These proposals remain on the table. The USSR and India were of the opinion that the experience of the Reykjavik summit demonstrated that given a constructive and realistic approach, far reaching agreements for nuclear disarmament could be achieved.

The two sides called for transfer of resources, currently directed to military expenditures, to meet the needs of socio-economic development. A part of the funds which will be released in the process of disarmament should be channelled towards rendering assistance to developing countries.

The Soviet side drew attention to the proposal put forward by the Soviet Union concerning the establishment of a comprehensive system of international security. The Indian side noted that this proposal is an expression of the need for new political thinking in the nuclear era.

In the course of discussions in New Delhi special attention was paid to the situation in the Asian continent, in the Indian Ocean and its adjoining areas where the process of militarization and military threat is mounting.

The two sides noted the urgent need for improving the political climate in the Asian continent and its adjoining areas, and search for ways of ensuring lasting peace, stability and development of economic cooperation. Progress in this direction could gradually be made, in particular, through normalizing the situation, creating an atmosphere of confidence and constructive cooperation at bilateral and regional levels.

In this connection the Soviet side explained in detail the Soviet Union's concrete program for maintaining peace and security and establishing cooperation and interaction in the Asian Pacific region. The Indian side elaborated on its consistent policy of reducing tensions, promoting good neighborliness with all countries in the region, and the steps taken by India along with other countries in building cooperation at the regional level through the South Asia association of regional cooperation without outside interference.

The Soviet Union and India expressed their concern over the further aggravation of the situation in the Indian Ocean and called for dismantling of all foreign military and naval bases in the area and for preventing the creation of new ones. Both sides condemned the attempts to build up foreign military presence in the Indian Ocean. They called for speedy implementation of the 1971 U.N. Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace and supported the decision of the United Nations General Assembly to convene, without delay, an international conference for this purpose. They noted that this conference has been inordinately delayed and believed that it is necessary to ensure that it is held at the earliest possible date, no later than 1988.

The Soviet Union and India were unanimous that the movement of nonaligned countries has evolved into an influential force in the relaxation of international tensions, promotion of peace, disarmament and peaceful coexistence. They took note of the movement's vitality in the struggle against imperialism, colonialism, neocolonialism, aggression, racism and apartheid, interference, and hegemony and for the realization of the new international economic order.

The Soviet Union reaffirmed its high evaluation of the Nonaligned Movement and of the constructive role played by India in that movement and in the international arena in

general, of its efforts to improve the international situation and to ensure equitable political and economic cooperation among states.

Both sides reaffirmed their abiding commitment to the United Nations, to preserving and strengthening this organization as an effective instrument of peace and security and peaceful settlement of international disputes and crises, and to the objectives and principles enshrined in its charter. They expressed their readiness to take necessary steps in order to ensure that the just and democratic principles on which the United Nations was founded become firmly rooted in the practice of international relations.

Moscow TV: Gorbachev, Gandhi News Conference

LD282047 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1530 GMT 28 Nov 86

[Joint news conference held by CPSU General Secretary Mikhail Gorbachev and Indian Prime Minister Rajiv Gandhi in New Delhi on 28 November; Gandhi speaks in English with superimposed Russian translation; from the "Vremya" newscast--recorded]

[Excerpts] [Gandhi] Esteemed General Secretary! Esteemed ladies and gentlemen! Friends! I feel that the visit of General Secretary Gorbachev to India is an important landmark on the path of strengthening Soviet-Indian relations.

The results of this visit are of great importance for bilateral ties, for the stability of the situation in the region, and -- perhaps most important -- for strengthening peace throughout the whole world. We have discussed many questions of mutual interest. First of all, questions concerning peace, nuclear disarmament, and development. We have signed a number of agreements. Perhaps the most important document is the Delhi Declaration that we signed yesterday with the general secretary. This sets forth the principles for a nonnuclear world, for a nonviolent world. We have signed an agreement on economic, scientific, and technical cooperation, and a consular convention, a protocol on holding festivals in the two countries, and a joint statement will be published at the end of the visit.

These agreements are a testimony to the maturity, stability, and dynamism that characterize Soviet-Indian friendship. The Delhi declaration is a historic document. Its international significance will increase in time. It is making a major contribution to international relations for which cooperation and peace are the main characteristics.

[Gorbachev] Respected Mr Prime Minister, respected ladies and gentlemen, comrades and friends! I must say, Mr Prime Minister, that you have made my mission both easier and at the same time more difficult. You have already said the main things. I could limit myself to just several remarks, or several words, or even one or two words perhaps by saying that I am fully in agreement with what you have said. But I think that then our colleagues in this meeting, the journalists, will be dissatisfied.

Returning to the content of the talks during the visit, I would like to say that there was not one single meeting which did not have at its center the most burning questions of international life. Mr Gandhi and I are in agreement that the Soviet Union and India consider it to be the primary task to rid the world of nuclear weapons, to overcome tension, to cool down the hot spots of the world. We believe that it is possible to do this, that it is possible to achieve this, not by way of confrontation and enmity, not by way of the absurd build up of force. The position of strength --

and I already spoke about this yesterday -- is calculated to bring about subjection to other people's will, encroachment of some people's interests, or simply the suppression of those not to one's liking. But we are deeply convinced that there is no future in such a position, and that its presence is totally unenviable and quite simply shameful.

The roads to the future are to be found by the assertion of new political thinking, by the understanding of nuclear space realities, by being aware of the interdependence of all countries, all people; and all states should take part in the construction of peace and reliable security.

[Question by unidentified correspondent] A question for Mr Gandhi. Mr Prime Minister, at present there is a process under way to actively militarize the Indian Ocean. It is noteworthy that there are no nuclear powers on the shores of the ocean, all the weapons are imported. Soon a conference is to be held on turning the Indian Ocean into a zone of peace. What, in your opinion, could its decisions ideally be? Could we not begin from here, from the shores of the Indian Ocean, the movement toward a nuclear-free world of the year 2000, the aim proclaimed by the Delhi Declaration?

[Gandhi] The Indian Ocean has already been declared a zone of peace by the United Nations. Unfortunately, the conference which should have taken place on this issue has not taken place yet. It has been blocked by certain powers. We feel that the Indian Ocean should be a zone of peace free from nuclear weapons. There should be no pressure exerted here, including military pressure, on the states in the region. But the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace is only one part of the world. We must look to the whole world as a zone of peace.

[Question by unidentified correspondent, in English with superimposed Russian translation] You know that this week the United States exceeded the limits of the SALT II treaty, producing a B-52 bomber capable of carrying cruise missiles. I would like to hear your opinion: What will the Soviet Union's answer be, and what effect will this have on the arms control talks?

[Gorbachev] This information has reached me through the press, But I am not yet familiar with the White House's official statements on this question. But if this is the case, if that decision has been made, then we consider this step to be one that simply contradicts the whole logic of the Reykjavik talks and even the statements made by the U.S. side after Reykjavik, that it remains committed to talks, to the quest for disarmament; and at the same time it demonstrates contempt for such an important treaty as the SALT-II treaty as well as the ABM Treaty. We believe that if this decision has been made it is a big mistake and it will make the search and the approaches to disarmament more difficult. But this is at the same time a stimulus for all those who understand the need for disarmament, for nuclear disarmament and the elimination of nuclear weapons. Hence we in the Soviet Union were right in addressing all people. The time now is such that everyone has to act together and to present his position to the government of the United States of America.

[Question by unidentified correspondent; in English with superimposed Russian translation] Please allow me to call you Comrade.

[Gorbachev] Please do , if you want to.

[Correspondent] Thank you. There are three parts to my question. Comrade Gorbachev, you have expressed the hope that the Afghan problem will be solved very quickly. I would like to know what this hope is based on. Are there any new proposals? Second,

you have talked about a security plan for the Indian Ocean. I would like to hear whether it is possible for Pakistan to be included in it? If so, then in what way? And third, what are your proposals for improving mutual understanding between the USSR and Pakistan? And what, in your view, is hampering the maintenance of good-neighborly and good relations?

[Gorbachev] Two words on each question. As far as our proposals on turning the Indian Ocean into a security zone are concerned, we -- that is to say our views here -- are close to the views of the Indian Government, views that have been mentioned here by the prime minister. We are willing to participate in a process that would lead to the creation of such a security situation, and that would answer the interests of all the littoral states -- and Pakistan is one of those -- and would also answer the interests of the whole community that uses the services of the Indian Ocean in the interests of development and cooperation. Your asked what is new that enables me to be optimistic about a settlement of the situation around Afghanistan. I think that there is a great deal that is new, both as regards the Cordovez mission -- there is some movement toward a meeting taking place there -- and as regards, I think, the desire of other states, including the Soviet Union, for a settlement of this problem.

Perhaps I could now confine myself to those remarks because it is particularly awkward to discuss this topic in concrete terms when a search is under way and when it is already of a quite specific nature. One would not want to hinder this process. And, finally, our relations, the Soviet Union's relations with Pakistan. As is well-known, we have always cooperated with Pakistan, an even when difficult moments occurred we did our bit to remove the tension in the region. We are prepared to act in the same way now as well. But we hope that Pakistan itself will think over its position with due regard for our common interest in normalizing the situation in the region.

[Question by unidentified correspondent] I have a question for Prime Minister Rajiv Gandhi. Mr Prime Minister, in his Vladivostok speech Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev proposed that a broad dialogue be started up on matters pertaining to security in Asia and the region of the Indian and Pacific Oceans. What contribution to the development of this dialogue has been made at the Soviet-Indian talks in Delhi which have come to an end? And how do you, Mr Prime Minister, evaluate this contribution? Thank you.

[Gandhi] As I mentioned in one of my speeches the idea of cooperation in Asia in the name of peace is not new. It was put forward by Jawaharlal Nehru almost 40 years ago, even before India obtained independence. I have always felt that for us to have true peace it is necessary for the level of international relations, not only India's relations but relations between other countries, to become more significant than the level of pragmatism. This can only happen if great mutual understanding is achieved between countries. And Asia is just the region where this could be done.

[Gorbachev] Good-bye.

PRAVDA Gorbachev, Gandhi News Conference

PM292041 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 30 Nov 86 Morning Edition pp 1, 2

["Joint Press Conference by M.S. Gorbachev and R. Gandhi"--PRAVDA headline]

[Excerpt] New Delhi November 29 (TASS) -- Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and Prime Minister Rajiv Gandhi of the Republic of India held a joint news conference here yesterday.

Opening it, Rajiv Gandhi said:

During the visit we discussed many spheres where we have common interests, particularly those like peace, nuclear disarmament, and development. The General Secretary and I signed on 27 November a number of documents. Perhaps the most important among them is the Delhi Declaration. It contains the principles of a nuclear-free and nonviolent world.

The Delhi Declaration is a document on an historic scale. Its international significance will grow more and more with the passage of time. It contains the principles of international relations based on freedom, equality, and nonviolence, and makes a major contribution to a positive world process which will be distinguished by cooperation and peace.

And now I would like to give the floor to General Secretary M.S. Gorbachev. This was his first visit to India. Unfortunately, however, he was unable to see more of our country. We hope that M.S. Gorbachev will visit us again and will have a chance to see more of India.

M.S. Gorbachev: Esteemed Mr Prime Minister;
Esteemed Ladies and Gentlemen,
Comrades and Friends,

This visit has had yet another peculiarity which has been connected with the current international situation. We have expressed our opinions and judgements about it over these days and you know them. The world situation is of a kind that makes it essential for such a powerful factor of tremendous international significance as Soviet-Indian cooperation to assume an even greater role in the world.

We have felt our responsibility these days not only to our peoples but also to the peoples of all countries and to the whole world for the policy we have been pursuing and the further steps we shall be taking either in cooperation or independently, just as it has been so far, in the interest of strengthening peace and averting nuclear war.

I think that the peculiarities I just mentioned make it possible to understand why the visit has been planned in this way and how it has passed.

As far as we, the leaders of these countries, are concerned, our task is to make certain that their relations at this new stage in world history be in even fuller accord with the principles of peaceful co-existence. Of course, these should be applied to practice. It is not enough to abide by political principles, it is important to demonstrate them in practical action. We are proud of this stand. And why shouldn't we? There are politicians that find other, very dubious reasons to plume themselves on. We have every reason to be proud of the policy of peaceful coexistence. But this also means to feel responsibility.

The high level of our relations has made it possible to issue such a document as the "declaration on principles for a nuclear weapon-free and non-violent world". I fully agree with the wide-ranging and convincing arguments given here by Mr. Gandhi when revealing the meaning of this important political document. It is a truly extraordinary document indeed, a document of great international significance. It reflects the role of the Soviet Union and India in world affairs and their moral right to make such an address to all mankind.

Yes, we are convinced that we have had the moral right to issue such a document as the declaration. It encapsulates a point of view, ours and India's, on the most vital problems of the present-day world. This document gives the world community a possibility to see the thrust of our thoughts, our real intentions and goals.

A joint statement has been issued on the visit's results. It is also unusual for its wide coverage of problems and for the similarity it shows of two countries' views and approaches to the pressing issues of international politics.

Returning to the contents of the talks during this visit, I would like to say that there has not been a single meeting that has not focused on the most urgent issues of international life. Mr Gandhi and I are unanimous that the Soviet Union and India consider it the task of tasks to deliver the world from nuclear weapons. Overcome tension, and cool the hot spots of the world. All this has been among the problems we have talked about.

We believe that this cannot be done, cannot be achieved through confrontation and enmity, through an absurd buildup of strength. The position of strength, and I have already said this once, is meant to bend others' will, infringe upon others' interests or even suppress the undesirables.

We are deeply convinced that this position has no future, while its present day is most unenviable or even disgraceful.

The routes to the future lie through affirming new political thinking, through understanding the realities of the nuclear and space age, through realizing the interdependence of all countries, and through becoming convinced that the building of peace and reliable security should involve all countries, all peoples, all states.

Mikhail Gorbachev and Rajiv Gandhi answered questions from journalists.

Question to Rajiv Gandhi. The Indian Ocean is being militarized. Symptomatically, there are no littoral nuclear powers and all weapons have been introduced from outside. A conference on the establishment of a peace zone in the Indian Ocean is scheduled to convene shortly. What resolutions could it pass?

Answer. The Indian Ocean has already been declared a zone of peace by the United Nations. Unfortunately, the conference which should have taken place has not taken place yet and we feel that it is being locked by certain nuclear powers which are interested in this. The Indian Ocean must be a region of peace, free from rivalries between nuclear powers, and here there must be no pressure at all, including military pressure, on small and littoral states. But the Indian Ocean is just one part of the whole world. We would like to see the entire planet a zone of peace.

Question to Mikhail Gorbachev. A few days ago the United States made the decision to renounce the SALT II Treaty by deploying a B-52 bomber armed with cruise missiles. What will be the Soviet Union's response and what effect will this have on the current arms control talks?

Answer: I learned the news you talk about from the press. I have not yet read the official White House statement. This decision, if it has really been taken, is contrary to the entire logic of the talks in Reykjavik and even to the statements made by the American side since Reykjavik that it remains committed to disarmament talks. At the same time, it demonstrates its disregard for such an important document as

SALT-II along with the ABM Treaty. We think that if such a decision is taken, it will be a bad error. It will complicate the search for and approaches to disarmament.

I would like to add also that these actions should add to the energy of all those who realize the need for disarmament and the abolition of nuclear weapons. They show anew that we in the Soviet Union are right in appealing to all the peoples to act and act together before it is too late.

Question to Mikhail Gorbachev. You have expressed the hope for an early settlement of the Afghanistan problem. I would like to know on what this hope is based. You spoke of a security plan for the Indian Ocean. What is your opinion about including Pakistan in this, and how do you see this taking place? How do you perceive the improvement of mutual relations between the USSR and Pakistan and what was it, in your opinion, that hindered the maintenance of goodneighborly relations?

Answer. As for our proposals on establishing a zone of peace and security in the Indian Ocean, they are close to the views of the Indian Government presented here by Mr. Prime Minister.

We are ready to participate in a process which would lead to security for all the littoral states, including Pakistan. This would meet the interests of the entire Indian Ocean community, the interests of development and cooperation.

As for the sources of our optimism about the settlement of the situation around Afghanistan, I think there are new developments both in the Cordovez mission and in the striving of other states, including the Soviet Union, to have this problem settled. I will draw the line at this remark because this subject should not be discussed in public when the process of search is under way. It may interfere.

Lastly, relations between the Soviet Union and Pakistan. We are known to have always cooperated with Pakistan and made our contribution even in difficult times to lessen tension in that point of Asia. We are ready to act in the manner today as well. We hope that Pakistan, too, will think over its position with a view to general interest in the normalization of the situation in the region.

Question to Rajiv Gandhi. Mikhail Gorbachev suggested in his Vladivostok speech a broad dialogue on security in Asia, the Indian and the Pacific Ocean. What contribution was made to this dialogue by the Soviet-Indian talks in New Delhi?

Answer: As I mentioned in one of my speeches, the idea of Asian cooperation for peace is not new. It was put forward by Jawaharlal Nehru almost 40 years ago. I have always felt that for there to be true peace we need the level of international relations -- not only India's relations with other states, but relations among all the countries of the region -- to become more meaningful and far removed from simple pragmatism. And this can happen only if more understanding is reached among countries. India is prepared to propose itself as the place where this can begin.

The press conference is over, thank you.

Delhi TV Gorbachev, Gandhi, News Conference

BK280900 Delhi Doordarshan Television Network in English 0425 GMT 28 Nov 86

[Joint press conference held by Indian Prime Minister Rajiv Gandhi and CPSU General Secretary Mikhail Gorbachev in New Delhi; Gorbachev's answers in Russian with simultaneous translation into English--live]

[Excerpts] [Gandhi] General Secretary, ladies and gentlemen, friends: -- I feel that this visit of General Secretary Gorbachev to India has been a major landmark in our bilateral relations. It has reaffirmed the strong friendship between our two countries. We have had very wide ranging discussions, very intensive discussions -- almost, I think if I am right, 10 hours between just the two of us -- and I feel that they have been very fruitful. They have been held in an atmosphere of warmth, of confidence, and of trust. Other talks have been going on at various other levels, at ministerial levels and other levels, between the two delegations. The outcome of this visit will be significant for our bilateral ties, for regional stability and perhaps most for world peace.

During this visit we have talked about many areas where we have common interest, more especially peace, nuclear disarmament, development. We have signed a number of agreements during this visit, perhaps the most important is the Delhi Declaration that the two of us signed yesterday. It lays our principles for a nuclear weapon-free world, a nonviolent world. We have signed agreements on economic, scientific and technological cooperation. We have signed a consular convention, a protocol on holding festivals in each other's country and, at the end of this visit, a joint statement will be issued. These agreements are a testimony to the strength, maturity, stability and resilience and the dynamism that Indo-Soviet friendship has come to mean. The Delhi Declaration is a historic document and its international significance will only be seen in time. It embodies a comprehensive new framework for international relations based on freedom, equality, justice and nonviolence. It will be a major contribution to cooperative and peaceful world order.

[Gorbachev] Distinguished Mr prime minister, distinguished ladies and gentlemen, comrades, friends! Let me say, Mr prime minister, that you have both made my task more difficult and easier at the same time. You have already discussed the major points and I could limit myself to merely few remarks, to few words, by saying that I fully agree with what you said. However, I believe that our colleagues at this meeting, journalists, will not be satisfied.

The high level of our relations made it possible to develop a document, I mean the declaration on the principles of nuclear weapon-free and nonviolent world. We signed this declaration yesterday with the distinguished prime minister and I fully agree with the extensive and convincing arguments that Mr Rajiv Gandhi adduced here in talking about the content of that document. Indeed this is a unique, extraordinary document, a document of great international significance. It reflects the role played by the Soviet Union and India in international affairs: their moral right to make such an appeal addressed to the humanity as a whole. Yes we are convinced that we do have, we did have, the moral right to sign the document, which was the declaration. The declaration reflects our and Indian standpoint regarding the most vital problems of present day world.

International community can see the basis of this document, the thrust of our reasoning, our thought, our real goal and intentions. Yesterday, the joint statement was also signed. This is also a unique document, an unusual document in terms of the scope of its problems and in terms of the commonality of approach with a view to urgent problems of international politics on the part of the two sides.

Now, returning back to the content of the negotiations that have been held during the visit, let me say that there has been not a single meeting which did not focus on the most urgent issues of international affairs. Mr Gandhi and myself see eye to eye in our belief that the Soviet Union and India believe that the priority task, the task of tasks, is to rid humanity and the world of nuclear weapons to ease tensions, to reduce

the temperature in different hotbeds around the globe. And all this constituted the problems that were discussed in the course of our meetings and exchanges. We believe that this can be done, this can be achieved not along the path of confrontation and enmity, not on the path of absurd buildup of power. The position of strength, as I said yesterday, is supposed to subordinate the will of the other, to impinge upon the interest of the others and even on crushing the others, those whom one is not happy with, but we are deeply convinced that this position is a non-starter and its presence is shameful and unseemly.

The road which leads to the future lies through new political thinking, through affirmation of this new thinking through the understanding of new realities, through growing awareness of the interdependence of all countries, through the strong belief that in the building of peace and global security, all nations, all countries must participate actively.

[Question in Russian with simultaneous English translation] Mr Prime Minister. In his statement in Parliament Mikhail Gorbachev proposed as a way to expand cooperation in the peaceful outer space to establish in India and international center for the training of cosmonauts and with a facility to launch spacecraft. Is this feasible? What do you think?

[Gandhi] I think it is a very good idea, but we will have to go into more details to see exactly how it can be implemented. We have not gone into those details yet, but I am sure we will.

[Question] This is Rangarajan representing ANDHRA JYOTI, a Telugu daily from Hyderabad. Your excellency has made a big overture for improving relations with China at your speech at Vladivostok. We wish you well in this effort, but I want to ask you a question which is of some concern to people in this country. That is, as you try to normalize your relations with China, there could be a possibility of military and other pressures being stepped up on our country which also has got a very long-drawn border dispute. The secretary general must have been aware of certain recent steps taken by China which constitute a throw-back on the position they had already taken. How Mr secretary general would see to it that this kind of a cynical exploitation does not take place and also an effort made by somebody else to make the milk of Indo-Soviet friendship sour?

[Gorbachev] So far as the last suggestion, I said already...I have spoken about this...that what we are doing in improving our relations with China will not weaken our relations with India. Those steps will never be detrimental to India, to the contrary, we will expand our relations with India and I think evidence to this is the current visit. As for the remaining portion of your suggestions, of your discourse, I hope that the better our relations are with all countries in the Asian and Pacific region and the better our relations are with China, between the Soviet Union and China, the better the overall atmosphere will be in the entire region and when the atmosphere improves, when the mutual understanding and cooperation expands, when a greater trust emerges, I think this will also have an impact on the policies of all countries and I am saying this with respect to the Soviet Union. I hope that I...I believe that India of course will act very responsibly in this situation. We have great experience in relations with India, and I hope, I think, I have no doubt that the Chinese Government will also act responsibly.

[Reporter in Russian with simultaneous English translation] Mr prime minister, at present, a process is underway of active militarization of the Indian Ocean and it is interesting to note that there are no nuclear powers that are littoral to this ocean. All those nuclear arms were brought in by other countries. Soon there must be a conference, there will be a conference, on making a zone of peace in the Indian Ocean.

Ideally, what do you think its decision, its resolutions should be? Could we from here, from the shores of the Indian Ocean begin a movement toward a nuclear free world by the year 2000 -- a goal that is also in the Delhi Declaration?

[Gandhi] The Indian Ocean has already been declared a zone of peace by the United Nations. Unfortunately, the conference, which should have taken place, has not taken place yet and we feel that it is being blocked by certain nuclear weapon states that have a vested interest in blocking. We feel that the Indian Ocean must be a zone of peace, free from nuclear power rivalries and it should not be such that it puts pressures, especially military pressures, on the littoral and hinterland states. But the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace is only one part of the world. We must look for the whole world as a zone of peace.

[Walter Rogers] Mr General Secretary, Walter Rogers, the American Broadcasting Company. As you know, the United States this week exceeded the limits of SALT II, the SALT II agreement, by arming additional B-52 bombers with air-launch cruise missiles. I'd like to know what your comments are on this please, what will the Soviet response be and what effect will this have on arms negotiations please?

[Gorbachev] Yes, I have heard this information, I saw it on the press but I don't know yet. I have not seen any official statements from the White House on this question. But if that were so, that decision indeed has been taken, then we believe that the step is contradictory to the overall, to the entire logic of the Reykjavik talks and to the statements even of the U.S. side after Reykjavik that the U.S. side remains committed to the negotiations to a search for disarmament. And at this time they are demonstrating contempt for this important treaty and also for the ABM Treaty and for the SALT II Treaty. We regard -- if this is done, if this decision is taken -- we regard this as a major mistake which will make it more difficult to search for the approaches for disarmament. But at the same time, this is incentive for all those who understand the need for disarmament, the need for nuclear disarmament for abolishing nuclear weapons. This is a stimulus to them. So we in the Soviet Union are right when we call on all nations to understand that today everyone should act together, everyone should declare its [as heard] position to the Government of the United States.

[Question] Your excellency, Hussaini, DAILY JANG, Pakistan. If I am allowed to address you as comrade. Comrade Gorbachev, [words indistinct] my question has got three parts. Comrade Gorbachev, you have expressed the hope for an early settlement of the Afghanistan problem. Now may we know what is the basis of your hope? Is there any new proposal coming forward? Secondly, you have spoken about an Asia-Pacific security plan. I want to know how does Pakistan fit into it, and if so, in what way. Thirdly, what are your suggestions for improving an understanding between the Soviet Union and Pakistan, and what irritants do you think there are which have prevented the two from maintaining good-neighborly friendly relations? Thank you.

[Gorbachev] A couple of words to each of your questions. As for proposals about the conversion of the Indian Ocean into a zone of security here, our views are very similar to those of the Indian Government as expressed by the prime minister here. We are

ready to take part in the process that will lead to the creation of a security environment here and this would be useful for all littoral states such as Pakistan and also in the interest of the entire community that is using the Indian Ocean for developing cooperation. You also asked about whether there is anything new about what makes me more optimistic about the settlement of the situation around Afghanistan. I think that there are indeed some new elements, many new elements.

[Question] [Question in Russian with simultaneous English translation] TELEGRAPH AGENCY of the Soviet Union. I have a question to the prime minister, Mr Rajiv Gandhi. Mr Prime Minister in his speech and [word indistinct] talks, Mikhail Sergeyvich Gorbachev proposed that wide dialogue begin related to the issues of security measures in Asia and Pacific region.

What is the contribution that was made in the course of the Soviet-Indian negotiations in Delhi -- that have just concluded -- (?was made to this process), and Mr Prime Minister what is assessment of that contribution. Thank You.

[Gandhi] As I mentioned in one of my speeches the idea of an Asian cooperation for peace is not new. It was put forward by Pandit Nehru almost 40 years ago even before India became independent. I have always felt that for true peace we have to move our foreign relations -- not just ours as India but in the world -- up from the level of real politic or politicking to a meaningful relationship between countries which goes deeper when just present convenience or pragmatism. And this can only happen if there is enough understanding and exchange between countries. Asia is a good region to start with.

Gorbachev Meets President Singh

LD261336 Moscow TASS in English 1326 GMT 26 Nov 86

[Text] New Delhi November 26 TASS -- TASS special correspondents report:

A meeting between Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and President Zail Singh of India, took place here today.

When greeting the Soviet guest, the president stated that his country welcomed Mikhail Gorbachev as an outstanding leader of the great power with which India is brought together with the ties of close traditional friendship.

"At the Soviet-U.S. meeting in Reykjavik, you, Mr Gorbachev, did a great thing for the whole of mankind: a message of peace to all people on earth came from there," the president stated.

"In your words," Mikhail Gorbachev said, "I see the opinion not only of India but of many other countries and peoples. The nuclear threat, ecology, backwardness and poverty of whole continents -- all these realities call for a new thinking and a new approach, and call for an end to the arms race."

"The Soviet Union's policy in matters of war and peace has much in common with the policy of India. The USSR's and India's opinion is the point of view of one billion people. We are ready to continue to cooperate with India, taking into account the new requirements of our times. I am confident that the visit will make a new contribution to the development of Soviet-Indian relations."

U.S., PRC Media Cited

PM041426 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 29 Nov 86 First Edition p 4

[TASS reports under general heading "Firmly Following a Course of Peace"]

[Excerpts] Washington, 28 Nov -- The Soviet Union and India, THE WASHINGTON POST writes, called for the imposition of an international ban on nuclear weapon tests, and this is just one of the important initiatives which crowned the Soviet leader's stay in Delhi. M.S. Gorbachev emphasizes that the Soviet Union is a champion of peace and nuclear disarmament, calls on Washington to change its stance, and lays on the United States the blame for the lack of progress on disarmament issues. Moscow emphasizes that the USSR desires to reach agreements on nuclear disarmament at a time when the Reagan administration is unwilling to take this path.

"The Indian Parliament," NBC-TV notes, "gave an exceptionally warm reception to Soviet leader M.S. Gorbachev, acclaiming him as an outstanding fighter for peace throughout the world." [passage omitted]

Beijing, 28 Nov -- "M.S. Gorbachev Calls for Peace Talks in Asia" -- this is the headline beneath which CHINA DAILY front-paged a Delhi report on M.S. Gorbachev's speech to the Indian Parliament. "The Soviet leader called for talks to be held in order to diminish the threat of war in Asia and the oceans adjoining its coastline, including discussion of questions involving the advance notification of transfers of and maneuvers by ground, naval, and air forces. In his Indian Parliament speech, M.S. Gorbachev proposed the start of talks with the United States and other nonlittoral states which have warships on permanent station in the Indian Ocean on a substantial reduction in the size and activity of naval forces there. [closing quotes not published]

PRAVDA Editorial On Visit

PM011459 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 1 Dec 86 First Edition p 1

[Editorial: "Important Factor in World Politics"]

[Excerpts] The official friendly visit to India by M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary the CPSU Central Committee, has generated a broad response among the world public. Its prime significance stems from the fact that the collaboration and cooperation between the two great powers are a weighty factor in world politics.

The high level of Soviet-Indian relations enabled the participants in the talks to deliver a document on a truly historic scale. The "Delhi Declaration on the Principles of a World Free of Nuclear Weapons and Violence" reflects the standpoint of the Soviet Union and India on the vital problems of the present-day. On behalf of the more than 1 billion men, women, and children living in the two nations, the USSR and India have called on the peoples and leaders of all countries to take immediate actions to lead us to a world free of weapons of mass destruction and war. Peaceful coexistence, states one of the declaration's 10 points, must become a universal norm of international relations in order that cooperation may replace confrontation in our nuclear age and conflicts may be resolved by political rather than military means.

The Indian side welcomed the Soviet Union's program for the complete, phased elimination of nuclear and other kinds of weapons of mass destruction by the end of this century. The participants in the talks called for the earliest conclusion of an

international convention banning the use of nuclear weapons and advocated an immediate halt to all testing of them. "The Soviet Union and India propose that an international convention be immediately concluded banning the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons until such a time as nuclear weapons are eliminated," the Delhi Declaration says. "This would mark an important and concrete step toward full nuclear disarmament."

The development of the situation in our anxious nuclear age insistently demands the emergence of new political thinking, particularly when questions concerning mankind's future are at stake. The two countries' leaders, the Soviet-Indian Joint Statement says, consider that the Reykjavik meeting showed the possibility of achieving far-reaching agreements on nuclear disarmament given a constructive and realistic approach.

It is well known that each nation's first step toward world peace begins on its own doorstep. That is why both the Soviet Union and India have a common concern for stability and security in Asia. It is natural that the talks devoted great attention to improving the political climate on the continent of Asia and adjoining regions and the search for ways of ensuring peace and stability there. Both sides favored the swiftest removal of existing centers of tension in the world and the prevention of new ones. This applies to the Near East, Southwest and Southeast Asia, and Central America. The Soviet Union and India roundly condemned the policy and practice of apartheid carried out by the racist South African regime and its state terrorism toward other African states and called for an immediate end to the illegal occupation of Namibia and the enactment of all relevant UN decisions on the granting of Namibia's independence.

Expressing disquiet at the further complication of the situation in the Indian Ocean, the Soviet Union and India called for existing foreign military bases there to be eliminated and the creation of any new ones prevented. They condemned the attempts to build up a foreign military presence in the Indian Ocean and called for the earliest implementation of the UN declaration on its being turned into a peace zone. The need for the earliest convening of an international conference on this question, no later than 1988, was acknowledged.

The Nonaligned Movement has become an influential force today. Its vitality is shown above all in the struggle against imperialism, neocolonialism, aggression, and racism. The Soviet Union confirmed its high assessment of India's constructive role in this movement.

The sides called for the restructuring of international economic relations on a just and equitable basis and for the establishment of a new international economic order. The solution of this topical task would be in the interests of all mankind, particularly the developing countries, and both the USSR and India are actively in favor of its implementation.

The visit's successful conclusion showed once again the importance of regular contacts between the leaders of the Soviet Union and India, which have become an effective mechanism for strengthening the relations of friendship, mutual understanding, and trust between the two countries.

IZVESTIYA Editorial on Gorbachev Trip

PM031628 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 3 Dec 86 Morning Edition p 1

[Editorial: "Our Friend and Neighbor"]

[Excerpt] [Passage omitted] The visit to India by M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, which ended last week is graphic evidence that today's

generation of Soviet and Indian leaders have taken from their predecessors the precious baton of friendship so as to carry it further, developing and filling with new meaning what was achieved in previous decades.

It goes without saying that the leaders of the two great states could not fail to devote attention to the most burning international problems. The situation urgently demands a new approach to the resolution of security questions and a new way of thinking in politics. Whatever contradictions may divide East and West, for all states and peoples a single interest common to all mankind has now come to the fore. In the nuclear and space age, we are fated to survive or perish together.

Aware of their lofty responsibility to all peoples and regarding the salvation of civilization from nuclear apocalypse as the ultimate task, the participants in the meeting signed the Delhi Declaration on the Principles of a Nuclear-Free and Nonviolent World. This is an extraordinary document, a document of great international significance. It embodies the will and aspirations of more than a billion people who live in the USSR and India, that is, one-fifth of the entire population of the earth. By drawing up this document the two states reaffirmed their determination to help establish the awareness of peace as the supreme duty of all mankind.

"Mankind deserves a better fate than to be a hostage to nuclear horror and despair," the declaration says. "It is necessary to change the existing world situation and build a world free from nuclear weapons, free from violence and hatred, fear and suspicion." The declaration proposes 10 principles which open up the path to this noble goal.

Yes, they open up the path, because the USSR and India do not simply proclaim the principles of a world free from nuclear weapons and violence, but are already putting them into practice in concrete form, in international relations. The Soviet program put forward on 15 January for the phased elimination of all nuclear arms and other means of mass destruction by the end of the century, the concept of creating a comprehensive system of international peace and security, our moratorium on nuclear explosions, a range of other peace initiatives -- all this is consonant with the line of the "Delhi Six," the line of peaceful resolution of conflicts pursued by India.

It is hard to exaggerate the significance of the fact that the USSR, a socialist state, and India, one of the founders of the Nonaligned Movement, have such a high degree of mutual understanding and trust. By the weight of their example they are paving the way to international security, hindering the tendencies toward militarism and diktat, and demonstrating the real possibility of opposing imperial designs and ambitions. The high degree of collaboration between our countries, which is reflected in the Delhi Declaration, also means that they can exert a beneficial influence on conflicts and explosive situations in various regions of the world.

This applies fully to Asia too -- the home not only of Indians, but of Soviet people too, since the greater part of our country's territory is in that continent. Stability and security for Asia are the common concern of the Soviet Union and India. And there is not only a need, but also an opportunity to radically improve the situation in that region by means of arms reduction, including nuclear arms reduction, the limitation of naval activity in the Indian and Pacific Oceans, and the elaboration and implementation of confidence-building measures.

It was quite natural for these constructive proposals, put forward by the Soviet side, to be the subject of conversations in Delhi, too. As a result of the discussions, the Soviet Union and India noted the pressing need to improve the political climate on the Asian continent and in the adjacent regions and to seek ways of ensuring lasting peace and stability and develop economic cooperation. Progress in this direction could be carried out by stages, at the bilateral and regional level.

The summit meeting in Delhi confirmed once again that cooperation between our countries is developing on an ascending plane and will strengthen. That is the wish of the Indians; that is the desire of Soviet people.

'Roundtable' on Gorbachev Visit

LD301850 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1230 GMT 30 Nov 86

["International Observers Roundtable" program with Academician Yevgeniy Maksimovich Primakov, director of the Institute of World Economy and International Relations; Nikolay Vladimirovich Shishlin, political observer; and Viktor Nikolayevich Levin, All-Union Radio commentator]

[Excerpts] [Levin] Hello, esteemed comrades. Today's broadcast is taking place immediately after the completion of Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's visit to India: a visit that has evoked a very wide resonance, above all, of course, in our country and in India, but also throughout the world. The reason lies in the fact that, in the course of the visit, a great many problems were discussed that go far beyond the limits of bilateral relations. And the very fact that during the talks that were held the Soviet Union and India expressed their firm conviction that the most important task now facing mankind is to strengthen peace and remove the threat of a nuclear disaster. This fact indicates that the problems under discussion are of vital and urgent concern to the whole of humanity.

[Primakov] Of course! And you know, although bilateral relations between the Soviet Union and India are of extraordinary importance for us and for India, it's natural that the discussions should have centered on these questions. Yet to restrict the results of the visit to those relations would be a very big mistake. Of course, those results go far beyond the framework of bilateral relations between the two countries. This is because the world today is very complex, and of course to a considerable extent peace [mir] is determined by Soviet-U.S. relations. We can't get away from that, because our two countries have from 93 to 97 percent of the nuclear missiles in their hands -- I mean the Soviet Union and the United States. The problem of peace depends primarily on them. But at the same time, to limit this to Soviet-U.S. relations would be altogether incorrect.

Nikolay Vladimirovich and I were present at the press conference in Delhi given by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev and Rajiv Gandhi. And in the course of that press conference -- as our listeners will know, of course -- the question was asked, how did Mikhail Sergeyevich react to the fact that the United States is departing from SALT II? Listeners know that the United States is, in effect, withdrawing from that treaty, as they are bringing into service a bomber equipped with cruise missiles without simultaneously taking out of service a corresponding number or other weapons, thereby exceeding the SALT II ceiling.

Well, when this question was asked, Mikhail Sergeyevich said that it was necessary to confront the United States with the position of the whole world. And what happened there, the fact that that [the Delhi] Declaration was adopted, the fact that talks were held on global questions -- this is, in some sense, a position that the United States is being notified of. And it's a very weighty position indeed, because what are we talking about? I'm not just taking numbers, as it were, not just the size of the population, though that, too, is important: a billion. A billion -- India and the Soviet Union. But what matters is the importance of these two countries. India, after all, is the leader of the Nonaligned Movement. India is a great Asian country, and a great global country, developing rapidly. And now we have declared that it is necessary to achieve a nuclear-free world -- that it is necessary to strive for a nuclear-free world.

[Levin] The Delhi Declaration, signed by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev and Rajiv Gandhi, sets out the principles of a nuclear-free, nonviolent world. Ten principles were enumerated. They are: 1) Peaceful coexistence must become the universal norm of international relations; 2) Human life must be acknowledged as the highest value; 3) Nonviolence must be the foundation of the life of the human community; 4) Mutual understanding and trust must replace fear and suspicion; 5) The right of every state to political and economic independence must be recognized and respected; 6) The resources now being spent on arms must be directed toward social and economic development; 7) Conditions must be guaranteed for the harmonious development of the personality; 8) The material and intellectual potential of mankind must be used to solve global problems; 9) Comprehensive international security must take the place of the balance of terror; and 10) If the world is to be free of nuclear weapons; nonviolent, concrete and urgent measures are needed to bring about disarmament. The Declaration lists these measures, and emphasizes that concluding an international convention banning the use or threatened use of nuclear weapons would be of particular importance at the present stage.

[Shishlin] I think, Viktor Nikolayevich, though of course as such, each of those principles is of fundamental importance for a radical improvement of the international political climate, still it seems to me that the significance and importance of the Delhi Declaration is determined to a still greater degree by the fact that it expresses, in very clear political language, the philosophy that corresponds to the realities of the nuclear space age. What this comes down to is the formulation of completely new, radically, fundamentally, qualitatively new approaches to the settling of all international problems. And the view that this encapsulates, though Soviet-Indian, is, I would say, a worldwide view. It's a view that takes into account not only the interests of the Soviet Union, not only of India, but also the interests of mankind as a single community, a world community: complex, divided by contradictions, but which really must learn to cooperate, learn to live together, to live in peace. That, I think, is the guarantee that the Delhi Declaration will be read, will be heard; that it will help to create healthier international relations, and work for the benefit of peace.

Well, I think while we're talking about the significance of the visit on the international plane -- and it's absolutely necessary to talk about that, because that is really the conclusion that's now being drawn by every politician and every observer, every spectator who's interested in international life -- but I think this international significance of the visit is also inherent in the very strengthening of bilateral Soviet-Indian relations. What Yevgeniy Maksimovich was saying, that it's a question of the declared political will of the leaders of two states that have a population of more than a billion people, in other words one-fifth of mankind, this is

already in itself an indication that this factor of stability, of healthier political weather, which Soviet-Indian relations have always represented, this factor is gathering strength, it's growing.

[Levin] I'd like to underline in this connection a thought expressed by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev at the Delhi press conference, that the Soviet Union and India had a full moral right to sign the Delhi Declaration. And indeed, take just the latest of India's actions in the international arena: actions that are linked with the actions of the Delhi Six, actions linked with the nonaligned movement. The Mexican Declaration of the Delhi Six: the six countries offered their assistance in monitoring [kontrol] the nuclear test ban. That's one of the crucial questions to today's world. The Harare Appeal of the Nonaligned Movement called on the Soviet Union, the United States and the other nuclear powers to take immediate steps to avert a nuclear war. The Nonaligned Movement urged a treaty putting a permanent moratorium on nuclear explosions.

These actions are organically interwoven with the large-scale, far-reaching initiatives recently put forward by the Soviet Union. Take the proposed total abolition of nuclear weapons by the year 2000; the proposal to ban and destroy chemical weapons; the proposal for a considerable, cardinal limitation of conventional armaments and armed forces; then finally, the position that was set out by the Soviet Union in Reykjavik. These are all actions, not just declarations in favor of peace. These are concrete actions that fill the appeals with material content. And of course, this element attracts special attention in our troubled world. And the authority of the Soviet Union and India is expressed in those principles of a nonviolent world free of nuclear weapons that are contained in the Delhi Declaration.

[Primakov] There are several points I'd like to emphasize. One of them is this: When the Delhi Declaration speaks of peaceful coexistence, and says it must become the universal norm of international relations, what is also being envisaged is that situations of conflict should be resolved by peaceful political means and not by military means. I think this emphasis is of the utmost importance. We usually speak of peaceful coexistence as a way, so to speak, of avoiding war on a global level; and that is, indeed, the main purpose of peaceful coexistence: to banish global thermonuclear war from the lives of men.

At the same time, there's an emphasis here on what I'd call the regional feature of peaceful coexistence. This is the need to achieve a successful solution of conflict situations by peaceful means. This is extremely important. A number of conflict situations are currently developing all over the world which, like detonators, can blow up universal peace. Many people are involved in them, colossal means are diverted to them, they entail great sacrifices, and they are always smouldering like hotbeds of destabilization for the world and can, indeed result in a universal explosion. They include, for example, the situation around Afghanistan. It was no accident -- no accident! -- that at the press conference Mikhail Sergeyevich was asked a number of questions on Afghanistan. In his replies, he stressed that we had brought our contingent of troops to Afghanistan not with the purpose of staying there, naturally, and that we intend to bring the troops out, but we are prevented from doing it immediately; talks are now being conducted on this subject. He emphasized, moreover, that Cordovez' mission, which has been under way for some time, has great importance in this respect.

[Primakov] Well, the replies by the general secretary with regard to the Indo-Pakistan conflict made a very great impression on me. You know, after all, that Pakistan is being supplied with arms by the United States. Now, the United States, just before the visit by the general secretary to India, made the decision to supply Pakistan with the AWACS system. This is a multipurpose action, because this system, if it is supplied to Pakistan, and, apparently it will be supplied, will be used to track the territory of the Soviet Union, Afghanistan, and of course, India, and will be used by the United States itself, too, if not primarily by the United States.

There is great concern about nuclear weapons being developed [rsozdat] in Pakistan. A great deal is spoken and written about this. This all creates a fairly acute situation, and India reacts sharply to this for perfectly understandable reasons. Well, Mikhail Sergeyevich said that if we go ahead and implement this security system in Asia, if we improve relations on many fronts -- USSR-China, China-India, and so on -- and we want this, then at the same time a situation will be created where there will be far more opportunities to regulate Indo-Pakistan relations.

[Shishlin] Of course, and it is actually here that the topicality of the visit lies, that of course, the visit in itself and the talks that have taken place have in a way opened up, extended the framework of those ideas that are now forming around the problem of strengthening peace and cooperation in the Asian and Pacific region, and, in essence, both in the Asian and Pacific region and in the zone of the Indian Ocean. And, you see, those ideas that were expressed in Delhi by both leaders, I think that, in themselves, these ideas are really very productive. Now the first response received on the results of the visit by the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee to India speaks of political circles, the public, taking stock, and not only taking stock but understanding what took place in the course of the visit in the Indian capital.

And, in fact, this gives grounds to state that this visit from the very outset acquired such a stature, such significance, that one may justifiably call it a historical visit. It placed Soviet-Indian relations on a qualitatively new level. This visit opens a new chapter in the history of the worldwide struggle against the nuclear threat, and it opens a new chapter in the history of establishing truly civilized relations between all members of the world community.

[Levin] Well, it is probably worth speaking in more detail of the nuclear threat. In the Delhi Declaration, it is specifically pointed out in the principles of a world free of nuclear weapons and violence which urgent steps are required to achieve the goal of disarmament, how to attain this world free of nuclear weapons and violence.

Above all, it is necessary to strive for the complete elimination of nuclear arsenals by the end of the current century. Second, a task of very great importance -- not to allow the placing of any weapons into space, which is the common property of humanity. Then, the complete prohibition of testing nuclear arms, the prohibition of the development [rsozdaniye] of new forms of mass-destruction weapons, the prohibition of chemical weapons and the elimination of chemical weapon stockpiles, the reduction of the levels of conventional weapons and armed forces. These are the specific tasks which are set, and, of course, a major step, a specific step on the path toward complete nuclear disarmament would be the implementation of the proposals by the Soviet Union and India of which we have already spoken, and in particular the proposal to conclude an international convention prohibiting the use of, or threat to use nuclear weapons.

Moscow 'Panorama' Evaluates Visit

LD010949 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1500 GMT 30 Nov 86

[From the "International Panorama" program, presented by Gennadiy Gerasimov]

[Excerpts] Hello Comrades! Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's official friendly visit to India has undoubtedly been the main event of recent days. In evaluating the results of the visit, three levels can be determined: the practical, the diplomatic, and the philosophical.

And now to the diplomatic plane of the visit. Our views of the world coincide on many matters. Our relations demonstrate to the world the possibility and the benefit of peaceful co-existence. On behalf of one fifth of mankind, our countries have addressed to the world the Delhi Declaration, based on the principles of a world free of nuclear weapons and violence. There are 10 of these principles; if they are followed, they will lead to a civilization without nuclear weapons.

The speeches of the leaders of the two countries, during their meeting in Delhi, mentioned that we must free ourselves of stereotyped solutions, that the situation demands a new philosophy in international relations, and that it is precisely in the relations between the Soviet Union and India that much of the new political thinking is manifested. Note was made of the search, common to our cultures, for the meaning of life -- of which Lev Tolstoy and Mahatma Gandhi wrote. The Delhi Declaration speaks of the priority of values common to all mankind; they are these -- life, freedom, peace, and the aspiration to happiness.

In our age of universal nuclear danger the interests of the survival of mankind must be placed higher than any others. And this is the natural approach, in the literal sense of the word "natural," because in nature -- and we, people, are a part of nature -- in nature each species strives first and foremost for self-preservation. For example, predators are sufficiently strong to kill their own kind, but they almost never do this. Predators probably have an instinctive braking mechanism aimed at the preservation of the species. Man has weak hands, but a strong head, and he has shown considerable imagination in the field of inventing instruments for the destruction of his own kind, having now reached the possibility of total self-destruction. Man has uncovered the deep secrets of inorganic nature, primarily in the context of nuclear physics. He has been confronted with the danger that this nature -- inanimate, but dangerous when liberated -- will destroy the living. And then only the inanimate will remain, because matter, as distinct from our life, does not disappear but is simply transformed.

And so, the Soviet Union and India proclaim the following in the Delhi Declaration: Mankind is worthy of a better fate than to be a hostage to nuclear horror and despair, and it possesses great resources to prevent such a catastrophe. The Delhi Declaration appeals for decisive and immediate actions for the sake of peace.

Moscow: 'VREMYA' on Visit

LD022335 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 2 Dec 86

[From the "Vremya" newscast; video talk by PRAVDA political observer Vsevolod Ovchinnikov]

[Text] Hello, comrades. Recently I had the opportunity of unexpectedly realizing in what remarkable times we live. On Friday morning I was one of the participants in the press conference in Delhi; yet that same day, sitting at home in Moscow that evening, I

watched it on television. Scientific and technological progress has reduced distances and made the world interlinked and interdependent as never before. But it has also engendered a common threat to all. The realities of the nuclear age demand a new political way of thinking, and the Delhi Declaration, which was signed as a result of the Soviet-Indian summit talks, is a model of this kind of innovative approach to the problems of peace and security.

For every people, universal peace starts on its own doorstep, so it is natural that the participants in the Delhi talks paid great attention to stability and security in Asia and in the expanses of the Indian and Pacific oceans adjoining Asia. Both participants are major Asian states and each for its own part is making efforts to unravel knots of conflict and to take away the acute nature of military confrontation in the region.

The principles of Pancasila, Bandung, and nonalignment which were mentioned in Vladivostok create, in the words of the Indian prime minister, the theoretical and political framework for analysis of the complex and distinctive problems of peace and stability in the Asia-Pacific Ocean region. Rajiv Gandhi's words about the Vladivostok speech aroused widespread reaction: The influential newspaper TIMES OF INDIA prefaced it with this headline: The Prime Minister Reacts Positively to Asian Security Plan.

The thing is, until recently the Indian mass media frequently misinterpreted this idea and were inclined to give the word security a military hue, saying India wants to join some kind of Asian-Pacific Ocean pact. Public statements made during the visit leave no place for such interpretations of the term "Asian security." It was stressed that the Soviet Union does not have a ready-made recipe for solving the problems of this vast and greatly populated part of the planet, so the essence of the Vladivostok initiative is an invitation to make a joint search.

We are not talking about the mechanical transfer of the European experience onto Asian soil, but about putting into practice the principles elaborated by the peoples of Asia long before Helsinki. The formula for security for all Asia must be the fruit of joint efforts and must be acceptable to all, and I think that the visit by the Soviet leader to India has brought sufficient clarity to this issue.

Gandhi Statement on Visit

PM041431 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 4 Dec 86 Morning Edition p 4

[TASS report: "In an Atmosphere of Mutual Trust"]

[Excerpts] Delhi, 3 Dec -- Indian Prime Minister Rajiv Gandhi has read a statement in the republic's parliament on the results of the official friendly visit by M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, to India.

M.S. Gorbachev's visit to India, the prime minister stressed, was held in accordance with the established traditions of exchanging contacts between India and the Soviet Union at the highest level. It became an important landmark in our relations and made a significant contribution to the strengthening of stability in the region and of peace throughout the world.

During the visit, the head of the Indian Government went on to note, M.S. Gorbachev and I had a useful exchange of opinions on questions of security in our region and confirmed the immutable effect of the Treaty of Peace, Friendship, and Cooperation concluded between India and the USSR. The joint statement published on the conclusion

of the visit reflects the close proximity or identity of the two countries' views on international questions. In addition, this visit demonstrated our peoples' firm commitment to international peace.

India, Gandhi pointed out, consistently pursues peace and disarmament in the United Nations, in the Nonaligned Movement, and through the initiatives of the six countries from five continents (the "Delhi Six"). During M.S. Gorbachev's visit the Soviet Union joined India in a joint vision of a nonviolent world free from nuclear weapons. The Delhi Declaration expresses the ideals of Mahatma Gandhi and V.I. Lenin. The Delhi Declaration is a vitally important initiative. It lays down principles which will be universally recognized if our planet is fated to have a peaceful future. The declaration has been distributed as an official document in the United Nations. We recommend to the world community that it adopt this declaration.

The visit by General Secretary M.S. Gorbachev to India, Gandhi stressed in conclusion, will be of abiding importance for the further development of Indo-Soviet relations and for the two countries' contribution to the cause of peace and stability.

Politburo Approves Gorbachev's Visit

PM051117 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 5 Dec 86 Second Edition p 1

[Excerpts] On 4 December the CPSU Central Committee Politburo considered and fully approved the results of Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's official friendly visit to India. The exceptionally warm reception the people and government of India gave the Soviet visit was noted. The talks with Prime Minister Rajiv Gandhi analyzed in depth the major issues of the present time, questions of the interaction of the two great peace-loving powers in the cause of eliminating the threat of nuclear war, and the improvement of all-round Soviet-Indian cooperation.

The Soviet-Indian summit meeting in Delhi again showed the closeness of the two countries' views on the main international issues. It advanced the cooperation between the Soviet Union and India to qualitatively new bounds, both in bilateral matters and in international affairs.

The Delhi Declaration on the principles of a nonviolent world, free from nuclear weapons, is a document of new political thinking, in tune with the conditions of the nuclear-space age. The principles and ideas formulated in it express the interests of the whole world community and the aspirations and hopes of all peoples, and are directed toward a peaceful future for mankind. The USSR and India, and many other states already implement them in concrete foreign-policy practice.

Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's talks with Rajiv Ghandi confirmed their common interest in an improvement of the political climate in the continent of Asia and on other regions, and their readiness to seek the resolution of conflict situations, the normalization of interstate relations, and the development of mutually beneficial economic ties. Progress toward these objectives could be accomplished in stages through the establishment of an atmosphere of trust and constructive cooperation on a bilateral and multilateral basis.

/12913

CSO: 5200/1136

RELATED ISSUES

MOSCOW COMMENTARY CITES GEN ROGERS ON REYKJAVIK, INF, CW

LD192324 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1900 GMT 19 Nov 86

[Commentary by political observer Eduard Mnatsakanov]

[Text] Sessions of the so-called North Atlantic Assembly have just ended in Istanbul. They were held as a kind of prologue for the NATO winter session set for December. And to ensure that everything is peace and harmony at the session, General Rogers, the supreme NATO allied commander, Europe, made a speech in Istanbul which was obviously something in the way of a set of directives. What did the American general say? First: The accord reached at the Soviet-American talks in Reykjavik on the reduction of strategic nuclear arsenals is just a distant dream, and so the United States and its allies have no option but to continue building up these arsenals. Second: The elimination of medium-range nuclear weapons would leave Europe defenseless in the face of Soviet aggression, and so NATO categorically objects to this accord which was also reached in Reykjavik. Third: We, declared General Rogers, see a threat of aggression with conventional and chemical weapons emanating from the Soviet Union, and so on our part we energetically have to develop and intensify these armaments.

It must be said that on this occasion the American general was not speaking on behalf of the Pentagon. He would not have cast aside all restraint in this way if he had not been counting on the favorable consideration and support of London, Paris and Bonn, where the alarm bells are ringing at the prospect of a nuclear-free Europe and of a nuclear-free world. Should Western Europe end up without its nuclear shield, so the theory goes, it will immediately fall victim to the overwhelming superiority of the conventional armaments of the USSR and the Warsaw Pact countries.

It is scarcely worth rebutting this many-times rebutted theory. First, even according to the estimates of Western specialists there is a rough equilibrium between the Warsaw Pact and NATO countries, both in conventional armed forces and armaments. Second, the alliance of socialist states has on numerous occasions proposed that the reduction of these forces be embarked upon on a parity basis. At the start of the year the Warsaw Pact states called on the other side to start talks on this issue without delay and they proposed a specific plan for the reduction of armed forces and armaments in the continent. As far as chemical weapons are concerned, the USSR has long been advocating the earliest, complete destruction of these weapons everywhere and the elimination of the very industrial basis for manufacturing them. The draft of the appropriate agreement was submitted by the Soviet Union at the Geneva disarmament conference.

In the West all these proposals are stubbornly being ignored and chatter continues to be heard at the same time about the overwhelming superiority of the Russians. And of

the quiet, in Washington and Paris, for instance, decisions have been adopted in the last few days to manufacture a fresh generation of chemical weapons. What are they driving at? Reykjavik showed that a world without weapons and wars is not simply a dream. It can and must become a reality. And a heavy burden of responsibility is assumed by those who attempt to blot out this reality.

/9274

CSO: 5200/1126

RELATED ISSUES

USSR'S PETROVSKIY TO UN ON SECURITY PLAN, TESTING, SPACE ARMS

Petrovskiy Speech

LD202031 Moscow TASS in English 1930 GMT 20 Nov 86

[Text] New York November 20 TASS -- The delegation of the U.S.S.R. to the 41st session of the United Nations General Assembly today expounded its views on the issue of the establishment of a comprehensive system of international peace and security.

Submitting this issue to the session for consideration, the socialist countries, including the Soviet Union, are guided by a serious apprehension over the destiny of peace, by the concern for the future of nations, V.F. Petrovskiy, a deputy minister of foreign affairs of the U.S.S.R., told the first committee.

The proposal is aimed at establishing in practice a world free from the policy of strength and from the threat of nuclear self-destruction, a just and democratic world where there will be neither a nuclear nor a military space club of some chosen nations. A humane world where the right of every human being to life will be guaranteed, where nations will be able to choose freely their own independent road of development.

A world characterized by law and order and morality, where a free and safe development of every nation will become the condition for a free and safe development and prosperity of the entire international community.

The mainstay of the entire edifice of security should be direct guarantees that both nuclear and conventional wars will be outlawed. The elimination of the material base for waging wars, disarmament that would physically rule out the possibility of use of armed strength are acquiring decisive importance.

A dependable security for all calls for the elimination of the existing arms arsenals on earth and for barring arms from space. A dependable security is impossible if the threat of war emanating from earth will be supplemented or replaced by a threat from space.

Comments on Debate

LD242313 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 24 Nov 86

[From the "Vremya" newscast, V. Lobachenko report]

[Text] The 41st session of the UN General Assembly is continuing at UN Headquarters in New York.

[Lobachenko] Attention of its participants is drawn to the discussion at the session's first committee of the issue of creating an all-embracing system of international peace and security. [Video shows panning shot of the audience, dwelling on Soviet, Ukrainian and Belorussian positions, among others] This issue has been included in the agenda at the suggestion of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries. Vladimir Fedorovich Petrovskiy, deputy USSR minister of foreign affairs, spoke at the session of the first committee. He stressed that the socialist countries, which have put forward the initiative, are guided by their serious alarm over the destiny of the world and their concern about the future of the nations. [Video cuts to an interview room, camera shows close up of Petrovskiy]

[Petrovskiy] Discussion of the issue of setting up an all-embracing system of international peace and security, which has just been launched at the First Political Committee following the initiative of the socialist countries, causes a great deal of profound interest on the part of a wide variety of countries represented at the General Assembly session. I would like to say that it leaves no one indifferent. They are talking now, arguing, and that can be seen as recognition of the significance of this issue, because what is involved is implementing new political thinking into the political thought and practice of international relations. What is involved is creating a guarantee of security in all spheres of international relations, a guarantee that would secure the future and enable mankind to survive in our nuclear and space age.

/9274

CSO: 5200/1126

RELATED ISSUES

USSR'S CHERVOV DISCUSSES SALT, ANTISATELLITE, LASER SYSTEMS

Zagreb DANAS 7 Oct 86 pp 50, 52-54

[Interview with chief of Directorate of General Staff for Disarmament Negotiations Col Gen Nikolai F. Chervov, by Miroslav Lazanski: "Coexistence or Apocalypse"; first paragraph is DANAS introduction]

[Text] The Soviet colonel general and head of the Directorate of General Staff for Disarmament Negotiations talks about how the USSR is going to match the American "Star Wars," about why the Americans have abandoned SALT II, about what the snag has been thus far in talks on Euromissiles, about what Moscow is offering as a foundation for the the reduction of conventional forces in Europe, and about how much the Soviet people can tighten their belts when it comes to military expenditures.

Moscow (from our special correspondent)--The Special Directorate of General Staff of the Soviet Army, responsible for disarmament negotiations, is located at Gogol'evskii Bul'var 6. At exactly 2:00 in the afternoon on 20 September, Col Gen Nikolai F. Chervov, the head of the directorate met me in this building. Col Gen Chervov is in fact also the leading Soviet officer in the negotiations with the Americans. The day before he had arrived from Jurmala, on the Baltic Sea, where a major American-Soviet meeting was held on the problems of the arms race. "There were several hundred Americans there, and regardless of their official spokesman, all these Americans came up to me and said, 'Comrade general, you are right, we have to stop Star Wars,'" Col Gen Chervov says.

Of medium build, gray-haired, witty and very eloquent in conversation, he did not at any point look at any papers during our talk. Col Gen Chervov was born on 22 November 1922 in Kemerovo, Siberia. He entered the war in 1941 at Moscow, and remained in it until 1945, having been wounded four times. He served as commander of a platoon, company and batallion within the armies of Marshalls Tolbukhin and Malinovskii. He fought in Romania, Hungary, crossed Yugoslavia in the area of Subotica, and then fought in Czechoslovakia. After the war he attended the Frunze military academy, was the commander of a regiment, a lecturer in the general staff academy, and worked on the staff of the military district as well. He has been on the general staff since 1969. He has been decorated with seven orders and many medals, and at the end of the

interview he examined with interest the collection of JNA [Yugoslav People's Army] badges and badges bearing Tito's likeness which I presented to him.

DANAS: General Chervov, what does the USSR have to say about the announcement by President Reagan that the United States is going to abandon the SALT II treaty?

Chervov: That is a good question, although it is in fact several questions and answers. Why did President Reagan announce this? Why do the Americans want to abandon SALT II? They explain their intention, or rather their decision, as being that we are violating this treaty. These types of insinuations are pretty naive and very easy to refute and criticize. The USSR acts very responsibly with respect to its commitments and strictly complies with them. We honor signed treaties. Not only do we see to it that we do not violate an agreement, we also announce to the Americans what we are doing and how we are doing it. With respect to the SALT II treaty, we announced to the other side all the details of the SS-25 missile and of the telemetric encryption of its data. Thus it is no surprise that the leaders of the American delegation at the American-Soviet Standing Consultative Commission are continually telling us, the Soviets, behind closed doors that the USSR is honestly fulfilling its obligations to the existing treaty. In fact, the real reason that the United States is renouncing the SALT II treaty is to be found elsewhere. First of all, the United States wants to withdraw in order to get away from parity of military forces, because SALT II is based on parity between the USSR and the United States. This is not in keeping with the Pentagon's military program, a program of an enormous gain in military strength, and this leads to the question of whether one should have a new military program or SALT II. Washington has given its priority to the military program. In addition, the United States wants to show the entire world that America can now decide on its own which of its agreements it will be accountable for, which it wishes to honor and which it does not. It has only one goal, and that is to eliminate all obstacles to the creation of its Star Wars program. It is in fact because of Star Wars that President Reagan is prepared to destroy all agreements with the USSR in the area of disarmament, including the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty, ABM. One gets the impression that the administration in Washington does not want any agreement on disarmament with the USSR. It wants a free hand in the area of nuclear arms, it does not want any real commitments. It is quite obvious what sort of negative consequences this could have. The arms race will intensify, distrust will increase, all of which will have a negative effect on international stability.

DANAS: General Chervov, I recently spoke in Washington with President Reagan's special adviser for arms control, Ambassador and Gen Edward Rowny. He had recently been to Moscow. I asked him what the basis was for the U.S. contention that the Soviets were violating the SALT II treaty with the new SS-25 missile. The Soviets contend that the SS-25 missile is simply a modernized RS-12, or SS-13 in the Western nomenclature, and that it is not a new missile. General Rowny told me that the SALT II treaty states clearly that a new intercontinental missile could not surpass an old missile in certain values by more than five percent if that missile is to be regarded, according to the treaty, as a modernization of an older system. According to the Americans,

your new SS-25 exceeds this five percent, and they think that it is a new intercontinental system. What is your opinion on this matter?

Chervov: I will attempt to explain to you very simply what the situation is with the SS-25 missile. We have, by the way, already explained this in detail to the Americans, and have even shown them the plans. I know General Rowny very well, we had talks recently in Moscow, and we met and negotiated 10 days ago in Washington. I am surprised at what Rowny told you, as if he forgot the essence of the problem. The issue is not this five percent. Our new missile has a warhead of a different construction, and the system for guidance and suppression of enemy anti-ballistic defense is no longer located in the warhead, but rather is housed in one of the stages of the rocket. This is the difference between the new and the old warhead and missile, and this is permissible in keeping with the SALT II treaty. Experts with the commission concerned with this in Geneva are well aware of this, especially the Americans. If you meet with Rowny again, show him this sketch, and when I see him again I will ask him why he is forgetting the facts.

DANAS: In the Soviet assessment is "Star Wars" an offensive or a defensive step in the arms build-up? Does this new technology jeopardize the agreement on anti-ballistic systems, the ABM treaty?

Chervov: President Reagan's Star Wars program is a purely military program, a militaristic program. What is its purpose? First of all, it represents preparation for a broad-echelon anti-missile defense, and secondly it represents the creation of space strike forces, space arms. It includes various types of lasers, systems with high-energy particles... When Weinberger and Abrahamson say that they are safe instruments, this is an illusion. Star Wars is nothing but the arms race in space, it is Damocles' sword above the earth. Now, in most recent times, all the advocates of Star Wars, including General Abrahamson, have taken a different turn in interpreting their project. They no longer deny that SDI is weaponry, as they were doing earlier, but now they contend that it is defensive weaponry. A simple play on words. Star Wars is offensive weaponry. Why? Because with new space systems you can destroy the other side's satellites. Is it because of this alone that we regard SDI as offensive weaponry? Its power, its capability to destroy targets at distances of 4,000 to 5,000 kilometers defines it as an offensive system. It is possible to use it to destroy any target on earth, on the seas. It is for this reason that the contention of those who say that it is defensive does not hold up. In fact, the Americans want to hold open their option, the first-strike priority, such that we cannot respond to a surprise attack. It is a question of the fact that they want to create a space shield over the United States and from beneath that shield inflict a strategic strike on the other side both from earth and from space. You know that this is the great adventure for the administration in Washington. They want to be untouchable in a possible nuclear war, they want to save themselves from nuclear catastrophe, which means that they have illusions about possible victory in a nuclear war. They think that they can win such a conflict. Set up the space shield and then dictate the conditions to all the countries of the world. That is the goal of Star Wars, that is the truth about SDI. And when Abrahamson says that the focus of SDI is defensive plans, that is only talk. Besides, General Abrahamson was refuted by

President Reagan. This past 8 September, he said that the United States will create space strike forces, will increase its strategic offensive systems, will completely realize its programs and strengthen its nuclear potential. The Pentagon is in fact doing just that. I would like to again emphasize that Star Wars is inconsistent with the ABM treaty. This agreement prohibits the expansion of anti-missile territorial defense, and the goal of SDI is to create just such a defense, just such a system. In addition, the ABM treaty prohibits the propagation of space arms, while the SDI program is creating this weaponry.

DANAS: The Americans say that you in the USSR have gone much further in anti-missile defense, that you already have your own "Star Wars."

Chervov: If they contend that we have gone further in Star Wars, then why not enter into the talks that we are constantly offering them? We are proposing the elimination of the anti-satellite system. They do not accept this. Right now, at this very moment, there are no arms in space, American or Soviet. We propose that they should never be any there. The Americans do not accept this. They propose several treaties on controlling future arms in space. We propose to the American side opening up our laboratories, allowing inspection of all research, all work. Why do they not accept this? What they are saying about a Soviet Star Wars is not true. The USSR does not have an adequate program equivalent to the American SDI, we are not creating space strike weaponry. That is the truth.

DANAS: Have you not, however, conducted several experiments in which you attempted to destroy a satellite using another satellite?

Chervov: No, that has not taken place. It is true that we have an anti-satellite system, but on earth. We have tested it, but have done so without selecting an actual target. But now we have stopped, since we announced a moratorium on this type of research 3 years ago. In the past 3 years, we have not done any tests in this area. We have proposed the elimination of this anti-satellite system to the Americans, but they have not accepted it.

DANAS: This means that there were experiments with an anti-satellite system 4 or 5 years ago in your country as well?

Chervov: Yes, we have such a system. But now there is a moratorium on research, and we are not making further improvements in it. We are not giving it up, but it is at a standstill, research is at a standstill. We hope that the other side will nonetheless accept our proposal. We are ready at any time to sign an agreement on the elimination of these systems on both sides.

DANAS: The Americans constantly contend that in Shari Shagan you have an advanced center for studying laser weaponry as well as anti-satellite systems.

Chervov: Yes, we have a laser system there, but it has no connection with weaponry. It is an experimental system for locating spaceships, with which we can determine with precision the coordinates of objects in space. American experts are well aware of this. They have all the tactical and technological data. For propaganda purposes, they say that we have a military laser system,

they say this to hide the purposes of their own Star Wars. Our laser facility at the Shari Shagan testing range is not weaponry. We cannot destroy a satellite with it.

DANAS: Does that mean that the recent statements by Gen George Keegan, the former head of U.S. Air Force intelligence, to the effect that Shari Shagan is the center of Soviet anti-ballistic defense because it is at the same time the center of anti-air defense, were inaccurate?

Chervov: That was all fiction. Our laser system at Shari Shagan is not in any way connected to anti-satellite weaponry.

DANAS: General Chervov, how will the USSR match the American "Star Wars" if the United States does in fact decide to continue with this program and if there is no agreement on this issue?

Chervov: It would be best if it did not come to that. When President Reagan announced SDI in 1983, he said that the goal of Star Wars is to invalidate the offensive nuclear potential of the USSR. In practical terms, this means to disarm the USSR. Of course, the USSR is compelled to take corresponding steps. We do not want to be without defense. We suffered enormous losses in the Second World War, and like you in Yugoslavia, we know what war is. We will not remain without a response to the American Star Wars, the Soviet people will not allow that. If it becomes necessary, we will quickly find a genuine response. A response that will invalidate the American SDI. Our general-secretary, Comrade Mikhail Sergeevich Gorbachev, has already talked about this. What sort of measures could be taken on our part? The first is an identical response: the USSR has such potential, in material, military and intellectual terms. As a second possibility, we could modernize our strategic arms, we could increase the number of our offensive systems, all of which could make the realization of the American SDI a very expensive undertaking and a nearly impossible plan. We have decoy warheads, cruise [missiles with] warheads, variable trajectories. There are a number of ways to render SDI ineffective. Basic research shows that there are various other options for countering Star Wars. We have all that we need for countermeasures. But they will not be what the Americans expect, they will be the ones that we choose. These measures will correspond to our defensive capabilities. Our response to SDI will put the Americans in a very difficult situation, and they will then have to take new steps. We do not want to contribute to the arms race, in keeping with an eye for an eye, a tooth for a tooth.

DANAS: Do you think that Western analysts are aware of how much the Soviet people are capable of tightening the belt with respect to expenditures for defense, for the military?

Chervov: There is no awareness of this in the West, they do not know the character of the Soviet people, our mentality. If we have to tighten our belts, then we will give up everything so that our defense can continue at the highest level. The Americans do not know what war is. The Second World War for them was somewhere far away. The combat in which they engaged in Europe was not their war, it was a show. They have still not recovered from the Vietnam War, they are experiencing the "Vietnam syndrome." Yugoslavs and

Soviets know what war is. We know that all this costs a great deal of money, we could be investing in new factories, in better stocked stores, but we cannot jeopardize our security. The Soviet people understand this very well.

DANAS: What is the current situation with the intermediate-range missiles in Europe? What about your SS-20 missiles and the American cruise missiles, the "Pershing 2"?

Chervov: This is very significant for Europe. We are proposing to the Americans the total elimination of Soviet and American intermediate-range missiles on the continent, the elimination of cruise missiles, the Pershing 2, of our SS-20s. We are proposing that all these missiles be physically destroyed. That there be no transfer of missiles to other locations. And all of this with the most rigid verification system, in the presence of international observers or others. That is our position.

DANAS: That is a fair position.

Chervov: Yes, we are simply asking that the American side not export, not sell its intermediate- and long-range missile systems to European countries. We are also asking that the nuclear arms of Great Britain and France remain at their current levels--however much they have right now. We have SS-20 missiles in the Far East. We are willing to deal with this question as well. The general-secretary, Comrade Gorbachev, has announced that we will not increase the number of SS-20 missiles in the Far East. According to our plan for the elimination of arms, there would be no missiles there in 15 years, of course under the condition that the Americans accept this plan, that they too offer a reduction in the number of their missiles. But what are they in fact offering? As if they did not have missiles in Europe, they made statements to the effect that they will withdraw their missiles if we, the Soviets, withdraw the SS-20. There is just such an opportunity at present, but they are not accepting it. They do not want to withdraw their intermediate-range systems from Europe. They propose to us that we eliminate all our SS-20s in both Europe and the Far East. However, they do not want to commit themselves to not exporting missiles to Great Britain or to any other country, the FRG, for example. This is where the negotiations on intermediate-range systems have stalled. They are at a standstill because of Washington's position.

DANAS: The U.S. administration says that Great Britain and France are independent countries and nuclear forces, and that the United States does not have the right to ask these things of London and Paris.

Chervov: We do not deny that these are sovereign countries. But the countries of the NATO alliance have the joint SIOP [single integrated operational plan], the plan for the deployment of nuclear arms. One of the components of this plan is the British nuclear weaponry. At present, Great Britain and France have 578 nuclear warheads, and this figure will be 1,100 in 1995. What we want is that this not happen, that it remain at 578. If we eliminate American and Soviet missiles in Europe, then the British and French ones will nonetheless remain. What do we do with them? They are not aimed at the moon, nor at Washington, they are aimed at the USSR. For this reason, we are asking that their number not increase. We have contacted the governments

of France and Great Britain, and they have told us that if we and the Americans reach an agreement, then they will join in. Right now it depends on the United States. I am under the impression that the Americans have no desire whatsoever to reach an agreement on these missiles.

DANAS: What does the USSR propose with respect to conventional arms?

Chervov: The member-states of the Warsaw Pact have a new proposal that we recently formulated at our meeting in Budapest. The Budapest formula is a major supplement to the Soviet proposals concerning the elimination of atomic weaponry. We propose the elimination of arms for mass annihilation, a reduction of military potential by 25 percent, or by a million people on both sides. At present, there are armies of around three million soldiers on both sides. Secondly, for the next year we propose a reduction of around 100,000 to 150,000 soldiers. We need to establish adequate systems for inspection, and at the beginning of 1990 we will go over to the second phase of reducing conventional troops. At that time, other countries could follow our example. We also propose concrete measures concerning non-aggression. This in fact includes measures on a reduction of tactical aviation, tactical nuclear arms, and a maximum reduction of troops along the confrontation line. All of this would come from steps for inspection of armies that would remain at their previous positions.

This is all within the framework of the Stockholm agreement. In short, the USSR proposes an entire series of disarmament talks. Everything depends on the United States and NATO. We are waiting and hoping that their response will be positive. Europe deserves to live in peace.

DANAS: General Chervov, are you personally pessimistic or optimistic?

Chervov: I am optimistic. Humanity is sitting on a mountain of nuclear arms. It is now a question of peaceful coexistence or apocalypse. We have no other alternatives. Anything else is nuclear catastrophe. I believe in human reason.

12271

CSO: 5200/3001

RELATED ISSUES

USSR: GERMAN GREENS IN MOSCOW DISCUSS SDI, CW, TEST BAN

Meeting With Shevardnadze

PM141136 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 14 Nov 86 First Edition p 5

["In A Spirit of Mutual Respect" -- PRAVDA headline]

[Text] Eduard Shevardnadze, member of the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee and foreign minister of the USSR, on 12 November received a delegation from the leadership of the Green Party (Federal Republic of Germany) consisting of L. Bechmann, J. Ditzfurth, A. Borgmann, N. Kostede, and O. Schily.

The sides held a thorough conversation on key problems of ensuring peace and disarmament in the light of the results of the Soviet-American summit in Reykjavik and on issues included in the agenda of the all-European forum in Vienna.

The Soviet side expressed the hope that all political forces opposed to war and committed to human survival would resolutely press in the current difficult international situation for curbing the arms race and establishing relations of trust and goodneighborliness among states with different socio-political systems.

The leaders of the Green Party voiced their support for the Soviet Union's programme for establishing a nuclear-free world, and expressed their own views on a number of aspects related to European affairs.

They denounced plans to militarize outer space, and came out in favor of ridding Europe of nuclear and chemical weapons.

Several issues related to the present state of the Soviet-West German relations were discussed during the conversation.

The meeting was held in the spirit of mutual respect and frankness [otkrovennost].

Talks With Gromyko

PM171049 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 14 Nov 86 Morning Edition page 1

["Meeting With the 'Greens' Party Leadership" -- IZVESTIYA headline]

[Text] Moscow November 12 TASS -- Soon after the end of the war, as far back as in 1946, the USSR suggested in the United Nations organization that nuclear weapons be

banned once and for all and that nuclear energy be used only for peaceful purposes. However, at that time the Soviet Union was the only one of the great powers to vote for this proposal.

This fact, showing when and who started the struggle for nuclear disarmament, was cited by Andrey Gromyko, member of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee and president of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet, in a conversation with representatives of the Green Party of West Germany. [paragraph continues]
He received in the Kremlin today a delegation of the Greens' Bundestag leadership who are staying in Moscow at the invitation of the Soviet Committee for European Security and Cooperation. The delegation is led by Anne-Marie Borgmann, co-chairman of the Greens' group in the Bundestag.

During the conversation the sides discussed topical international problems in the setting of the results of the Soviet-American meeting in Reykjavik and questions connected with Soviet-West German relations.

Andrey Gromyko emphasized that Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central committee, had set forth the stand of the Soviet side at the Reykjavik meeting in a frank and convincing manner. It included history-making proposals. The stand of the Soviet side set forth at the meeting took into account the interests of both countries, of their allies, of all the countries and peoples of the world. The Soviet viewpoint was the concrete expression of a new thinking the need for which is being dictated by the realities of the nuclear-missile age.

Seeking to reach agreements, the Soviet Union put forward proposals which, if accepted, would ensure a possibility of reducing and later on fully scrapping nuclear weapons.

However, the accord that was practically achieved on those Soviet proposals failed to be translated into final agreements, because the American side did not wish to create conditions for their realization. It insisted on the notorious Star Wars plan -- the so-called Strategic Defense Initiative, and adopted the stand of eroding the antiballistic missile agreement.

And still, Andrey Gromyko continued, even today possibilities continue to exist for reaching agreement. With this in view it is necessary to start from the level reached in Reykjavik on the reduction and elimination of nuclear weapons. It is this level that was used as a starting point for the Soviet proposals that were put on the negotiating table in Geneva.

The Soviet side pointed out that the FRG Government had unfortunately supported the stand of Washington which had blocked the advance towards the agreement.

On behalf of the Green Party its leadership welcomed the decision of the Soviet Government to prolong for the fourth term the unilateral moratorium on nuclear tests. In this connection the need was emphasized for the U.S. to join this step taken by the Soviet Union for the sake of reaching agreement on the discontinuation of all the nuclear explosions.

The delegation of the Green Party said that, of course, the governments of West Germany and other West European countries could, if they wished, promote by their actions the attaining of this goal.

In conclusion, the head of the delegation said that it had become more clear to the Greens on which questions they maintained common views with the Soviet Union. She expressed gratitude for the frank conversation.

The meeting was attended by L.N. Tolkunov, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet of the Union and chairman of the Soviet Committee for European Security and Cooperation; V.V. Tereshkova, member of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium and chairman of the Committee of Soviet Women; and V.G. Vysotin and R.B. Eldarova, chiefs of USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium departments.

DPA Version of Talks

LD131852 Hamburg DPA in German 1723 GMT 13 Nov 86

[Text] Moscow, 13 Nov (DPA) The Greens delegation has described its talks in Moscow so far as "very open and direct." The press spokesman for the Greens, Franz Staenner, told DPA that the impression to date was that the Soviet partners in the talks had been extraordinarily interested in the Green Party and also in the peace movement in the Federal Republic.

At the same time, there have also been clear differences of opinion on disarmament and human rights questions. The six-man delegation from the Bundestag group and the national party executive held more than 7 hours of talks on 12 November with President Andrey Gromyko and Foreign Minister Shevardnadze. Today, talks with the Soviet minister for nuclear energy are on the agenda.

On disarmament questions, the Soviet side continued to insist on its package solution put forward in Reykjavik, it was reported. However, the Greens stressed that partial solutions must also be possible and could signal the start of an overall disarmament process. In addition, the delegation touched on human rights violations in the Soviet Union and called for the release of all political prisoners. The group also asked to be allowed to visit the Soviet civil rights campaigner Andrey Sakharov.

A further talk on Friday is planned with Central Committee Secretary Anatoliy Dobrynin. The talk will center on disarmament issues. It is now unlikely that there will be a talk with party leader Mikhail Gorbachev.

The Greens delegation includes Lukas Beckmann, Jutta Ditzfurth, and Nobert Kosted from the National Executive, parliamentary party spokeswoman Annemarie Borgmann, and former Bundestag member Otto Schily.

Dobrynin Receives Delegation

LD141558 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1513 GMT 14 Nov 86

[Text] Moscow, 14 Nov (TASS) -- Anatoliy Dobrynin, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and Vadim Zagladin, member of the CPSU Central Committee and first deputy chief of the CPSU Central Committee International Department, today received a delegation from the Green Party (FRG) in the CPSU Central Committee. The delegation is in Moscow at the invitation of the Soviet Committee for Security and Cooperation in Europe.

A wide range of questions was examined, in particular the struggle against the arms race, for disarmament, and ecological and humanitarian problems. The representatives of both parties noted a significant coincidence in their positions on the central question of modern times -- the prevention of nuclear war and the achievement of lasting peace.

The desire was expressed on both sides to strengthen peace and confidence in Europe, and this includes expressing support for ideas aimed at doing away with nuclear and chemical weapons and at reducing conventional arms in central Europe.

The difference existing between the CPSU and the "Greens" on some questions should not impede joint or parallel actions in this direction.

Both sides expressed the desire to develop cooperation between the CPSU and the "Greens" in the interests of strengthening peace, and in this connection they reached agreement on a number of specific steps.

Greens Hold Press Conference

LD141610 Moscow TASS in English 1503 GMT 14 Nov 86

[Text] Moscow November 14 TASS -- We are deeply convinced that the far-reaching Soviet disarmament proposals are of history-making significance. A statement to this effect has been made today by Lukas Beckmann, one of the leaders of the Green party (FRG). He was addressing here a press conference for Soviet and foreign newsmen given today by the delegation of that party's floor leaders in the FRG Bundestag.

Lukas Beckmann stressed that the members of the delegation highly appreciate the preparedness of the Soviet side to draw the European nations into the disarmament dialogue on an even broader scale.

Otto Schily, member of the delegation, pointed out the highly negative attitude of the "Greens" to the American "Star Wars" programme. We feel that it is not of a defensive, but an offensive, aggressive character, he said. The so-called "Strategic Defence Initiative" is rejected in the FRG also by the social democrats, trade unions and representatives of religious circles. Deplorably, the country's government practically misses no opportunity to express its support for that programme. We resolutely condemn this policy.

Evaluating the meetings and conversations held in Moscow. The members of the delegation pointed out their frank and well-wishing character. They declared for broadening contacts between the Green Party and the CPSU, and pointed out that despite the distinctions in views, such contacts are useful for a mutual clarification of the stands.

DPA Version of Conference

LD141742 Hamburg DPA in German 1510 GMT 14 Nov 86

[Text] Moscow, 14 Nov (DPA) -- Both Soviet head of state Andrey Gromyko and Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze again mentioned in the talks with representatives of the Greens in Moscow Federal Chancellor Helmut Kohl's controversial remarks in an interview. Shevardnadze said that Kohl's remarks were "an insult to every Soviet family," Greens member Otto Schily said at a press conference in Moscow today. Both politicians have pointed with great seriousness to the chancellor's comparison between Mikhail Gorbachev and Nazi propaganda minister Joseph Goebbels.

According to Greens spokesman Lukas Beckmann the Greens made clear their appreciation of the Soviet disarmament proposals. At the same time, however, they also spoke against the linkage between agreement on disarmament and limitations on the United States SDI project tabled by the USSR at the Reykjavik summit. In this question there were differences of opinion in the analysis and the practical implementation.

With regard to human rights in the USSR the group stressed what they saw as a direct connection existing between internal democracy and peace toward the external world. A visit to Soviet dissident Andrey Sakharov was refused, Beckman said. In a letter to

party leader Mikhail Gorbachev the delegation asked for the release of 18 political prisoners in the USSR.

Greens spokesman Jutta Ditzfurth described her talks with Soviet nuclear experts as "controversial and unpleasant." The Soviet side expressed its known position of a stepped-up expansion of nuclear energy. The Chernobyl nuclear accident was attributed solely to human error. The Soviets said that measures have been taken against an existing residual risk of another accident. Furthermore, the delegation submitted documents from which, according to Frau Ditzfurth, it emerged that the USSR obtained uranium from Namibia, contrary to United Nations regulations on this matter. The Soviets with whom they talked rejected this, but stated that uranium from that country could possibly reach the USSR with incorrect labels.

The six delegates from the federal party executive and the Bundestag group of the Greens concluded their 3-day visit to the USSR on Friday.

/9274

CSO: 5200/1126

RELATED ISSUES

CANADA: POLL SHOWS NUCLEAR FEAR, CRUISE TEST OPPOSITION

Windsor THE WINDSOR STAR in English 7 Nov 86 p A8

[Text]

More than one-third of Canadians believe we are edging closer to nuclear war, according to a national survey conducted for The Windsor Star.

A nationwide telephone poll of 1,684 Canadians shows most don't trust the United States or the Soviet Union and believe Canada should have an independent foreign policy. The poll was conducted by Angus Reid Associates on Nov. 1-4 and is considered accurate within 2.5 percentage points 19 out of 20.

According to the poll, 37 per cent of Canadians believe the risk of nuclear war has increased over the last five years. Only 14 per cent said we now live in a safer world, while just under one-half (46 per cent) believe there has been no change in the risk.

Perception of the risk varied according to age and sex. Women (46 per cent) were far more likely than men (28 per cent) to indicate the increasing threat of nuclear war. Younger people are more pessimistic. The poll showed 42 per cent of respondents aged 18-34 believed the risk of a nuclear war has increased compared to 37 per cent in the middle-aged group and only 28 per cent of those over 55.

MOST CANADIANS believe a nuclear war is more likely to break out by accident rather than a deliberate confrontation. Fifty-three per cent said nuclear war will be set off by an accident triggered by human or equipment error, compared to 36 per cent who said a deliberate confrontation is more likely. The one important exception is

younger Canadians who were about evenly divided as to which scenario is more likely.

Respondents indicated neither superpower is trusted in this country when asked which superpower would be most likely to start an accidental or deliberate war. Those Canadians who believe an accidental nuclear war is more likely were about equally divided as to whether the Soviet Union (25 per cent) or the United States (23 per cent) would be responsible. About one-fifth (18 per cent) of respondents volunteered that both superpowers would be equally likely to accidentally trigger a nuclear war. Ten per cent said neither superpower is likely to accidentally start a nuclear war while eight per cent volunteered some other country.

Quebec residents were more likely to name the Soviet Union as the superpower most likely to accidentally start a nuclear war, while British Columbians were more likely to name the United States as the villain. Canadians in other provinces were about evenly divided.

THOSE CANADIANS who believe a deliberate war is more likely were slightly more likely to blame the Soviet Union than the United States (30 per cent compared to 25 per cent, respectively). Eleven per cent volunteered that both superpowers could be responsible for deliberately starting a nuclear war. Nine per cent said neither superpower would deliberately start a nuclear war, while 13 per cent named some other country.

Canadians are more inclined to regard U.S. President Ronald Reagan as a man of peace compared to Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev, but not by much (34 per cent compared to 25 per cent).

There was a sharp division between east and west on this question. Western Canadians are almost evenly divided as to whether they trust Reagan or Gorbachev. Central and eastern Canadians are much more likely to trust Reagan.

Canadians also want an independent foreign policy, which could reflect Canadians' distrust of the two superpowers. The pollsters asked if Prime Minister Brian Mulroney supported Reagan's position on foreign policy matters too often or whether they think Canada has a sufficiently independent foreign policy. Respondents were twice as likely to say Mulroney toes Reagan's line too much as they were to indicate that our foreign policy is independent enough (59 per cent compared to 27 per cent). The perception that the PM's ties to the Reagan administration are too close is widespread across the country with a majority of respondents in all demographic groupings agreeing with this opinion.

This trend is reflected by continued opposition to testing of the cruise missile. Respondents indicated by a margin of almost 2-1 that they oppose cruise testing. The only exception is Alberta where public opinion is about evenly divided.

/9274

CSO: 5220/14

RELATED ISSUES

CANADIAN ROLE IN PREVENTING NUCLEAR WAR DISCUSSED

Toronto THE SATURDAY STAR in English 15 Nov 86 p A6

[Article by Kim Zarzour]

[Text]

Canada has a crucial role to play in the prevention of nuclear war, a York University conference on peace has been told.

Panelists taking part in the Pathways To Peace conference yesterday agreed that Canada should reassert its role as world peacekeeper and establish itself as the international seat for world relations.

Jag Maini, special adviser with the Canadian Forestry Service, said Canada is ideal for the job.

"As a nation, we have an image of international boy scouts," Maini said. "We don't have a vision of being a superpower. And we can use that to make things happen."

Fiona Nelson, chairman of the Association of Large School Boards and a Toronto trustee, said this nation "can become the common meeting ground for (the superpowers) to solve their differences."

"There's no reason why we couldn't do what Vienna does."

About 80 students, academics and peace activists attended the first session of the two-day conference held by York University's Calumet College Peace Committee.

The conference, sponsored by York and the Canadian Institute for International Peace and Security, ends today.

Chris Winter, a member of the organizing committee, said the event could become an annual one.

"We're trying to get away from the con-

ventional us-and-them, ban-the-bomb movement," he added. "Instead, we want to talk about what we mean by peace and how to go about obtaining it."

Nelson told the conference that Canadians should meet more Soviets and Americans face to face to prevent the kind of conflict that erupted last month at a high school in Toronto's west end. About 50 protesters shouting anti-Soviet epithets clashed with students when four Soviet officials visited. Humberside Collegiate.

"If we continue to talk about the evil empires of the world and if we avoid contact . . . we're more likely to be hostile with each other," she said.

Robert Matthews, a political science professor at the University of Toronto, cautioned that preoccupation with the nuclear arms race can blind the public to other, more dangerous threats developing in the Third World.

World war could "sneak through the back door" as a result of the growing number of Third World conflicts, Matthews said. Such disputes can lead to world war when a superpower intervenes, he warned.

Part of the solution, according to Matthews, is to establish "spheres of influence" that the major powers agree to respect. As well, regional associations must be reinforced so the groups involved in a conflict can work together to solve their own problems, he said.

/9274

CSO: 5220/14

END